IMPRIMATUR.

Z. Isham R. P. D. Henrico Episc. Lond. a Sacris, April 6. 1686.

IMPRIMATUR.

Z. Isham R. P. D. Henrico Episc. Lond. a Sacris, April 6. 1686.

REMARKS
UPON THE
REFLECTIONS
Of the Author of
Popery Misrepresented, &c.
ON HIS
ANSWERER;
Particularly as to the
Deposing Doctrine.
In a Letter to the
AUTHOR of the *Reflections*.
Together with some few *Animadversions* on the same Author's *Vindication of his Reflections*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Sam. Smith* at the *Prince's Arms* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1686.

SIR,

IT is not any diſtruſt of the Abilities of your former Adverſary (which have ſufficiently made him known) nor an overweening Opinion of my own undertaking, that hath engaged me in this Controverſie, but a deſign to ſerve the Intereſts of Truth, and to aſſure you, that you have not yet convinc't the World, that your Character of your Religion, as you repreſent it, is ſo juſt, and exact, or your Reaſonings ſo cogent, but there is ſomething [perhaps material, and of weight] to be objected to both; and I ſhall follow the Method, that * you profeſs to like, to reaſon as cloſely, as I can, with all *moderation*, and *calmneſs*, without making any Reflections, but ſuch as cannot be avoided, when I treat of ſome Subjects, among which, I dare undertake, none ſhall perſonally concern you; tho you will allow me to tell you, you have not ſo carefully followed your own præſcriptions, when you impeach our † Church in general, reckoning her *Books of Homilies* among thoſe Books, that have *miſrepreſented Popery*; and in particular charge your learned, and modeſt Adverſary with the * ſame crime, and too liberally beſtow your Characters on him, charging him † with *wronging you*, and *impoſing upon his Reader*, with * *Sophiſtry*, with *underſtanding neither Law, nor Logick*, and with being *inſincere*, and *uſing tricks*, but probably the Anſwer hath made you angry, and men in a paſſion cannot forbear hard Language.

* Reſl. p. 1.

† Reſl. p. 2.

* P. 3, 4, 18.

† Reſl. p. 6.

* P. 16, 17, 18.

I do acknowledge, that it is ſevere dealing to pick up all the extravagant paſſages in private Authors, and to father them on the whole Church (no Church, of whatever denomination, being without both evil men as to their Morals, and opinionative men as to their Tenets) but withal I muſt ſay, that it is one thing to cite Quotations from all ſorts of Authors, and another thing to cite Men of Eminence, and Authority in your Church, (and ſuch, whoſe Station, Learning, and Repute, were as great, as ever the *Biſhop of Condom*'s, or *Monſieur Veron*'s, whom yet you rely upon, as you alſo ſometimes quote other men of your Communion to confirm your Opinions) whoſe Books alſo have come into the World with Licence, and Priviledge, and Commendations of the Authors, and whoſe Aſſertions have never been condemned, after they have been publiſht, (and ſome of them probably Members of that very *Trent-Council*, which you ſtick to for the Articles of your Faith) and in matters of fact, which cannot be forreign to the Controverſies between your Church, and ours, there is a neceſſity of having recourſe to ſuch Writers, as I ſhall be often forc't to do in theſe *Remarks*.

And that I may conſider every thing methodically, that belongs to this *Topick*, I cannot but obſerve your * *Reflections* on the Opinions of ſome Eminent men in our Communion, which, ſay you, we are unwilling to have charg'd upon our Church. For the firſt, which you charge on your Antagoniſt, *That, good works of juſtified perſons are not free*, I muſt ſay, that either I miſunderſtand your Adverſary, or you do

* Refl. p. 13, 14.

do *misrepresent* him; for when † he says, *That, what we pretend to merit by, must be our own free act*; (for these are his words, and not as you quote them) citing for it the Authority of the *Jesuit Coster's Enchiridion*, and adds, *That therefore the works of justified persons cannot be said to be their own free acts, because the power of doing them depends upon Divine assistance; and being done by the power of God's grace, which could never have been done without it, cannot be* (for that reason) *truly meritorious*, he is so far from giving an account of the Doctrine of our Church, that he proves from the principles of your own, that, if good works be done only by the Grace of God, and made acceptable only through the merits of Christ, they cannot be truly said to be meritorious, because not the free acts of them, that do them. † Ch. 6. p. 43. Ed. 3.

When Mr. *Thorndyke* allows of *prayers for the Dead* (though you quote no Book of his for that Assertion) he does no more, than in some sense our Church allows, when it prays for a joyful Resurrection in *her Office at Funerals*; and whatever the good man might add else of his own, was but his private Opinion (as is also his notion, that the *Eucharistical Sacrifice is truly the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross propitiatory, and impetratory, as well as the other*, which I take upon your credit, not having the Book by me, out of which you cite the Opinion) however we assert, that Mr. *Thorndyke* never owned *Prayers for the Dead*, as you do (but in the sense of some of the Antients) for he denied *Purgatory*, upon which you ground your *Prayers for the Dead*, and that our Blessed Saviour is really present in the Sacrament, is the Doctrine and Belief of the

Church

Church of England, and did not you limit that *Real Presence* to *Transubstantiation*, there would be no *difference* between you, and us in that point.

I cannot but observe your disingenuous manner of treating the Author of *Jovian*, in charging him with a disloyal principle, who hath given as many Instances of his Loyalty, in the most difficult times, as any man of his station; and were there no other, the writing of that excellent Treatise, in that critical juncture, is an undeniable evidence of it, when by defending the Succession, and the Doctrine of Non-resistance, he acquired the ill will, and displeasure of all the disloyal Party. Why did not you, nor any other of the English Roman Catholicks, write then in the defence of those Doctrines, against the disloyal and rebellious Doctrines of *Julian*?

Præfat. Bellarm. ante tractat. de potestate summi Pont. adversus G. Barclay.

The Press was open for you, and perhaps there was reason for your not answering of them, * because the generality of the Writers of your Church agree with that Author in his principles of disloyalty. Well, but you have found out one disloyal principle in *Jovian*, but are you sure of it? It is not your saying, It is a disloyal principle, that makes it to be so, and therefore I must desire you, and those that perhaps are misled by you, to read the Book from p. 139. to p. 152. out of which you have cited the passage, and then you will find it to be such a disloyal principle, as will not allow any Christian subject "[εἴτε ἱερεὺς τίς ἐστιν εἴτε ἀρχιερεὺς, εἴτε τὴν μονήρη βίον "ἐπαγγελλόμενος.] to pray for the death of a *Nero*, *Dioclesian*, (though he set up Inscriptions, *ob deletum nomen Christianum*,) *Constantius*, or *Valens*, but only for

Theod. on Rom. 13. 1.

for a *Julian*, whose Apostasie and Wickedness is singular in Ecclesiastical History, and the like of whom in all probability can never be expected again.

Nay Sir, this disloyal principle will not let Christian subjects pray, for the death of a *Julian*, though he tyranizes never so much over their bodies, goods and liberties, if he do not blaspheme Christ, and persecute the Church of God, with a diabolical spite, against the evidence of Divine Miracles. It leaves the Christian subjects of all Tyrants, but such as are *Julians indeed*, under the obligation of praying for them, according to the Apostle's direction, and the practice of the Primitive Christians, which the Author of *Jovian* hath so much insisted upon, and commended; and his Prince must be a *Julian indeed*, a *Julian* in all circumstances, before he can be so much as tempted to pray against him; for he doth not say, that he would pray, but that he should be tempted to pray for the destruction of a *Julian indeed*. And it had been happy for the Christian world, if the chief Pastors, and Bishops, and Councils, and Doctors, and Casuists, of that which you call the Catholick Church, had never taught any principle more disloyal than this. Now Sir, I beseech you, to tell me, how much disloyalty there is in this principle, which secures all Infidel, Heretical, and Apostate Princes against the Prayers of their Christian subjects, unless they be in all degrees as bad as *Julian*, and secures even *Julians* themselves against all resistance? and how much disloyalty there is in a man, who by his principles will pray for all Tyrants, but such an one as *Julian* was, according to the Author of *Jovian*? Sir I would to God you, and your Doctors would declare

declare as much Loyalty as this; and I desire you to tell me, that suppose a Roman Catholick Prince should become a *Julian indeed*, and take up the methods of that Apostate, whether you think his Roman Catholick Subjects would be tempted to pray for his destruction? and if they should do so and no more, do you think they would transgress any rule of Christian Loyalty? Answer me these two questions sincerely and positively; and if your answer to the last, be affirmative, give your arguments for your Opinion, and I dare engage, the Author of *Jovian* shall submit to your reasons, or answer them.

For I am confident he hath no fondness for his Opinion, to which it is evident he was led, by his great Charity for the Bishop, and Church of *Nazianzum*. And though in apologizing for them, he hath asserted, that he should be tempted to pray for the destruction of a *Julian indeed*, yet he is so Loyal a Person, that I believe he would overcome the temptation, and only forbear praying for him, as having sinned the sin unto death.

After which Apology you will suffer me to tell you, that your *Reflections* will hardly be called an answer to *the Doctrines, and Practices of the Church of Rome*, because in them you have not said a word to some *material points* of Controversy between you, and us, stated in that Book out of the *Trent-Council* and *Catechism*, as if either the right were on your Adversaries side [which, I suppose, you will be loath to acknowledge] or his reasonings were unworthy your second thoughts [which, I suppose, you will not own, and if you do, few wise men will acquiesce

in

in your Sentiments] for you wholly prætermit reflecting upon the Chapters of the *Eucharist*, of *Indulgences*, of *satisfaction* ex condigno, of *keeping the Scriptures, and Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, of *communion in one kind*, and of *adding the Apocrypha*, and *traditions to the holy writ*, with some others; which, being some of the *most material points* in difference between your Church, and ours, will either deserve some new thoughts, or you will allow us to say, that that book cannot be thought an answer, which in silence passes by, or leaps over so many weighty things, that make up so much of the Controversy.

You assure us, * *that the Council of* Trent *is received here, and all the Catholick World over as to its definitions of Faith, though it be not wholly received in some places as to its other decrees, which relate only to discipline.* Where I shall not ask, what you mean by the *Catholick World*, for I am well assured that you mean all Christians of the *Roman* persuasion, which is a very narrow notion of the *Catholick World*, excluding all other Christians from being Members of the Catholick Church, but those of your own Opinion; so that neither the *Greek* Church, nor the rest of the *Eastern* Christians are in your sense any more Catholicks, than the Church of *England*, and the rest of the *Protestants* (though antiently any man, or Church of men, were called *Catholick*, because they agreed with the whole *Catholick Church* in Faith; but now the *holy Catholick Church* of *Christ* must lose its name, if it agree not with the particular Church of *Rome*) but I would willingly know of you, whence any particular Church hath that power, that it may receive a *general Council* (as you call that of *Trent*) in

* Refl. p. 5.

ſome things, and not in others? I thought, that the higheſt authority of the Church on Earth had been a *general Council*, and if ſo, why its definitions in matters of diſcipline ſhould not be received and obſerved by all particular Churches, is to me a great queſtion; for I cannot but ſee, that one of theſe two things muſt follow from your Opinion, either that *Councils* and *Popes* are fallible (for if they are deceived in one Opinion, ſuch as that of the power of the Church to *depoſe Princes*, why may they not be deceived in another, ſuch as *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Purgatory*?) or elſe, that they are infallible in greater matters only, and then to me it is a great wonder, that they ſhould erre in things of leſs moment; and I never yet underſtood, but that if *general Councils* could decide matters of *Doctrine*, but that they had alſo as great a power in matters of *diſcipline* (for if it be a lawful preface to the decrees of all *Councils*, as your men ſay, *Viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto, & nobis*, then the *holy ſpirit* is doubtleſs their guide in matters of *diſcipline*, as well as in matters of *Doctrine*.) I am ſure, that the *Antient Councils* took upon them to decide both by their authority, and all Chriſtians thought themſelves oblig'd to follow their dictates; ſo the *firſt general Council of the Apoſtles* bound up all Chriſtians from *eating things ſtrangled, and Blood*; ſo the *Council of Nice* determin'd the preciſe day, when *Eaſter* ſhould be celebrated, as well as the *Conſubſtantiality of the Son with the Father*; and ſo alſo the *ſecond general Council* made *Conſtantinople* a *Patriarchate* as well as *Rome*; to go no further. And I find no perſons diſputed thoſe conſtitutions (though only in matters of *Diſcipline*, and *Government*) till the *Popes* began to aſſert their Authority in oppoſition to *general Councils*.

And

And whereas * you ſay, that your Adverſary *wrongs you*, and *impoſes upon his Reader*, by ſaying, that *you give your private ſenſe, and Opinion only of the Articles of your Religion contrary to the Bull of* Pius 4. pleading in your own behalf, *that you expound the Canons of the* Trent-*Council according to the Catechiſm ſet forth by the order of the Council, and the Pope*, as if both of them allowed of it; I muſt ſay, that this cannot be, for the *Council* never ſaw the *Catechiſm*, and conſequently could never approve, that they never ſaw, unleſs they alſo were bound to exerciſe an implicite Faith; for though they ordered a * *Catechiſm* to be publiſht (having obſerv'd, how much the *Proteſtants* prevailed againſt their Church by their conſtant *Catechizing*) they left it wholly to the *Pope* to ſee it done, and to give it authority; and this the Author of the *Prolegomena* to the *Paris Edition* of that *Catechiſm*, *An.* 1671. fairly acknowledges *, affirming, that after the diſſolution of the *Council*, *An.* 1563. ſeveral Fathers were ſummon'd to *Rome* to make this *Catechiſm*, among whom the principal man was *S. Barromée* (as you call him) *Archbiſhop* of *Millan*; we are alſo told, that *Cardinal Seripandus* made the explanation of that Article (*one holy Catholick Church*) *Michael Medina* of another, *&c.* and that after it was finiſht, it was *An.* 1566. offered to *Pope Pius* 5. for his approbation, who committed the examination of it to *Cardinal Sirlet*, who taking to himſelf the aſſiſtance of other learned men, examined both the matter, and language of it, after which the Pope gave his approbation, and ordered it to be printed by *Paulus Manutius*, confirming it by his *Bulls*. And *Poſſevine* tells us, that *Gregory* the 13. made this *Catechiſm* the rule, by which he reformed the *Canon*

* Refl. p. 6.

* Seſſ. 18. & Seſſ. 25.

* Prolg. 2. & 3.

Refl. p. 6. *Law*; ſo that if * you *interpret the Canons of the Council by the Catechiſm*, then the *Canons* depend upon the *Catechiſm* for their meaning, and the ſenſe of the *Catechiſm* upon the *Pope*, who gave it authority, by which deduction it appears, that your Religion is ſtill built not on the *Council*, but on the *Pope*; and perhaps it was for this reaſon, that the *Italian Biſhops* in their *Synods* (as do the *Synods* of *Roven*, and *Aix* in *France*) call it not the *Trent*, but the *Roman Catechiſm*, for in truth ſo it is. Againſt all which I know only this to be objected, that the ſame men, that made the *Canons*, made the *Catechiſm* (which is hardly true, as to every particular perſon) but to that I anſwer, that I believe, you will not averr; that the ſame men have the ſame aſſiſtances in a *Council*, and out of it; ſo that were the aſſertion true, yet the one being done in *Council*, had the aſſiſtance of the Bleſſed Spirit (as you hold) to aſſiſt the Compilers; which, I preſume, you will not ſay, that the ſame men had, when out of the *Council*.

And if this be ſo, then does not this make the *Pope* judge of Controverſies of *Faith*? For, ſay you, *the Church muſt interpret Scripture, and interpret Articles of Faith declared in Councils*, which Church muſt either be the *Church Repreſentative*, or the *Pope*; now to hope for a *general Council* upon every emergent diſpute in matters of *Faith*, is a vain expectation, and if ſo, you will do well to ſhow us any other judge in ſuch caſes, but the *Pope*; unleſs every particular Church muſt judge for it ſelf, or every private perſon be his own director, and then, where is the interpretation of the *Church Catholick*?

Now

Now if the *Pope* be the Judge, how know we, but the next *Pope* may require the belief of the *Depoſing Doctrine*, and expound the paſſages of former *Councils* that look that way, as Articles of *Faith?* what would you do in that caſe, eſpecially if the generality of the *Eccleſiaſticks* ſhould ſide with him [as they did in the caſe of the *Emperour Henry* 4. and of our *King John*] and in their *Synods* declare for the *Eccleſiaſtical Monarchy?* —and upon this ſuppoſition, how know we, but that, although the preſent *Pope* hath confirm'd the *Biſhop* of *Condom*'s Book, another *Pope* may condemn his mincing the Articles of Faith? for we do not want Inſtances of *Popes*, who have reſcinded, not only one anothers *Acts*, and *Ordinations*, but one anothers *Decrees*, even in what they have called *matters of Faith*; although I muſt confeſs, what is very obſervable, that though very many *Popes* have aſſerted the Eccleſiaſtical Power over Princes, and their *Right of Depoſing* them, we never read of one of them, that condemned the Doctrine.

You further ſay, * that though the *Trent Council mention the Aid, and Aſſiſtance of the Saints, and Angels over and above their Prayers, yet it means no other Aid, but that of their Prayers*, which ſeems to me not ſo agreeable to the words of the *Council* †, which are, *That it is good, and uſeful ad ſanctorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere, to fly to their Prayers, Aid, and Aſſiſtance.* Now I cannot believe, that the Fathers of that *Council* would have explain'd a particular act by two more general words, nor when they had mention'd in particular, *Prayers*, would they, I believe, have afterward inſerted in general their

* Refl. p. 7.

† Sſſ. 25.

their *Aid*, and *Assistances*, unless the *Aid*, and *Assistances* were distinct from their *Intercession*; and this is agreeable to your allowed Prayers in your *Missal*, where you beg God, * *ut ejus meritis, & precibus, &c.* *that by the merits, and prayers of St.* Nicolas, *you may be deliver'd from the flames of Hell.* And again, † *That by the merits of St.* Peter, *and St.* Paul, *you may attain the glories of Eternity,* where the *Merits*, and *Intercessions* of *the Saints* are manifestly distinguisht, as they are also in the *Trent-Catechism*, * where in the Margin there is this Note, *The Saints help us with their Merits*; and in the body of the *Catechism* these; *They always pray for the happiness of men, and God confers many benefits upon us, eorum merito, & gratiâ, for their merits, and sake*; and truly, were we assured that the Guardian Angels could hear us, I see no reason why we should scruple any more to pray them to protect us against the Devil, and all other Enemies that may hurt us, than to beg them to intercede for us to God; and this also is agreeable to the *Catechism* †.

* *Dec. 6. in fest. S. Nicol.*

† *Jul. 6. Octav. SS. Petri, & Pauli.*

* *Part. 3. præcept. 1. n. 24.*

† *Ubi supr. n. 18.*

* p. 8.

Your next *Reflection* * is about the *merit of good works*, and your self, and adversary are agreed, that *Can. 32. Sess. 6.* of the *Council of Trent* there is no mention of the qualification of *Merit* with respect to dependance on God's grace, goodness, and promises; but both in that *Canon*, and *Can. 26.* the words are plain, *quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam (misericordiam) & Jesu Christi meritum, &c.* And if so, the Controversie seems to me easily decided; *for if it be of grace, how is it then of works?* where is the merit?

Your Answer to the *Goliah Argument* of your Adversary, as you are pleased to call it, I remit to be consider'd

conſider'd towards the end of theſe *Remarks*, becauſe it ought to be ſpoken to more largely, and by it ſelf, and proceed to take notice, that * you blame your Adverſary for *taking the ſenſe of your Church from ſome expreſſions in your old Miſſals, and Rituals*, [tho I am apt to think, that the Church of *England* will be contented to be judged by her *Liturgy*, and *Rituals* in the like caſe] but perhaps you are not diſguſted at the uſe of your *Miſſals*, but at the uſe of *old Miſſals*; and I am perſuaded, that you have reaſon ſo to be, becauſe the ſubtilty of the modern Church hath made it ſelf appear in your preſent *Miſſals*, and *Breviaries*, as well as in your Edition of the *Vulgar Tranſlation* of *the Bible*, and in other Treatiſes. For inſtance, in the old *Roman Breviary* printed at *Venice An.* 1482. and at *Paris An.* 1543. *Jun.* 28. *lect.* 2. *noct.* 2. *S. Leonis*, the words run thus, *In eo Concilio damnati ſunt Cyrus, & Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, &c.* in *that Synod Cyrus*, and *Sergius*, *Honorius*, &c. *were condemned*; but in the new *Breviary* the name of *Honorius* is left out, which, had it been left there, would have reflected too much on the *Papal Infallibility*, and inform'd the World, that even *Popes* themſelves have fallen into Hereſie; while in the ſame Office they take care to keep up the memory, that that *Pope Leo* 2. *fregit ſuperbiam Ravennatum, brought the Archbiſhop of* Ravenna *to acknowledge the* Roman *Supremacy, which before that time that See did not.*

* Reſl. p. 11.

A ſecond Inſtance may be this: In all the *antient Miſſals* in *Cathedra, S. Petri Antioch, Feb.* 22. (as alſo in the old *Diurnale* printed at *Antwerp* 1553.) the Prayer is read in theſe words, *Deus qui B. Petro Apoſtola*

ſtolo collatis clavibus regni cœleſtis animas ligandi, atque ſolvendi pontificium dediſti, i. e. *O God, who having given thy bleſſed Apoſtle St.* Peter *the Keys of thy heavenly Kingdom, gaveſt him Epiſcopal power of binding, and looſing Souls*; but they have now left out the word *Animas, i. e.* Souls; for with that limitation the *Pope*'s power was only Prieſtly to uſe the Keys *in binding*, and *looſing men's Souls*, but without that limitation every man is at liberty to believe that St. *Peter*'s Keys may be imployed in temporal affairs alſo, in *binding Kings*, and ſetting up a *Pontifical Monarchy*, to which I ſhall add one Inſtance more; that whereas in the *Sacramentarium* of St. *Gregory* the Prayer for St. *Leo* runs thus, *Annue nobis, Domine, &c. Grant, O Lord, that this Oblation may be advantageous to the Soul of thy Servant* Leo; now the words are altered into, *Annue, &c. Grant, Lord, that by the interceſſion of thy Servant* Leo, *this Oblation may be profitable to us*; the firſt being an Inſtance of the Antients Prayers for the Dead, for Saints, as well as others; the latter an endeavour to countenance Prayers to Saints by aſſerting their interceſſion.

And whereas to requite us for quoting your *Miſſals* *, you object to us all the *expreſſions of Prayer, Preaching, and Devotion in our Church*, the parallel doth not hold, unleſs you mean our authoriz'd *Liturgy*, in whoſe collects we are ready to vindicate, whatever is aſſerted. Nor is it fair to ſay, *that an Atheiſt may make himſelf ſport with Scripture, if he may be allowed to ſeparate an infinite number of expreſſions there, i. e.* as I underſtand you, to make uſe of broken ſentences (for if an Atheiſt uſes Scripture in the ſenſe, to which the coherence leads him, he can never

* *Ibid.*

ver make *Chriſtianity* ridiculous, much leſs *as ridiculous as Turciſm*) and for the paſſages quoted out of your *Miſſals*, they are quoted in the ſenſe, in which they are meant, and if you deny this, you may right your ſelf by ſhewing the contrary.

Nor do you do well with the Church of *England* to ſay, * ſhe *allows the Pſalms in Meeter.* I dare be confident to averr, that the *Singing* P*ſalms* (as they are uſally called) were never commanded by our Church to be uſed, and are no part of our ſervice, as our *Rubric*'s will inform you, where there is not the leſt mention of them ; though we acknowledge, the cuſtom was brought in through the connivance of our Governors, who at that time were intent upon matters of greater moment ; nor do we ſay, *that the ſenſe of the Church will help out the nonſenſe, or ill expreſſions of any of thoſe Rhymes* (which is a ſubtle inſinuation) but withal we ſay, that ſince cuſtom hath brought in the uſe, no Prieſt of our Communion, that I know of, is ſo weak (I am ſure, no one ought to be ſo) but he knows how to chooſe out of that great number ſome few Pſalms, that are pertinently enough tranſlated, and incentive of Devotion, by ſinging of which neither God is diſhonor'd, nor the Congregation engaged to any thing, that is either evil, or ridiculous ; which Apology cannot be made for any of your *Miſſals*, which your Prieſts were obliged to uſe without any power left them to chooſe what *Collects*, or *Antiphona*'s, *&c.* they pleaſed.

* Refl. p. 11.

And now you will allow me to ſmile, when † you ſay, *that if we conclude a Papiſt guilty of Idolatry, becauſe he bows down, kneels,* &c. *to an Image, we may*

† Refl. p. 12.

as well say, that Abigail *was guilty of constructive Idolatry, when she fell on her face before* David, *and so are Subjects, when they kneel to their Prince, and the* Lincolns-Inn-Field *Beggars, when they kneel for an Alms to those, who pass by.* For these instances do not reach the case, that we are talking of; for if *Abigail* should have kneel'd before the Picture of *David*, or a Subject before the Picture of his Prince, or a Beggar before a Gentleman's Picture, and begg'd with earnestness, and seeming devotion any blessing, there is no sober man, but would believe, that they were either very mad, or very fooliſh; but if they thought them sober, and in their right sense, (as we do believe your people at Church to be) they cannot be acquitted of Idolatry, if so be the honour be Religious (as you acknowledge, your veneration of Images is more than civil honour) so that by these instances you seem to run into the errour of those * *Schoolmen*, that the same honour (let it be *Latria*, *hyperdulia*, or *dulia*) is due to the Image, that is, due to the person represented; and if any Law be to be judg'd of by the common practice (as the Maxim saith, *Lex currit cum praxi*) this is very plain from the usages of the generality of people in your Church. And I am sure, (to confirm this your way of arguing) that I have somewhere read (though I cannot now readily light on the place) that *Scribanius* affirms, that *Adoration of Saints, and Images* is very lawful, because *Abraham bowed down to the Children of* Heth, Gen. 23. 7. *Surrexit Abraham, & adoravit populum terræ, filios*, viz. *Heth.* As it is in the *Vulgar Latine.* And if I must not judge of any man's Idolatry *by his outward actions* (which is your exception) then I can never know any man to be an *Idolater*; for a Heathen may fall down before one of his Idols,

* *Alens. Aq. Bonav. &c. apud Bellar. to. 2. lib. 2. c. 20. § 2. Opinio.*

Idols, and call upon it for help, and yet ſay, that his intention is juſt, and that he only meant thereby to worſhip the True God, which is the excuſe made by the men of your Church.

After this, * you compare the *Power of the Pope to that of Civil Powers, as to the Obedience due to them from their Subjects*, but, pray deal candidly, Do you believe the *Pope* to have no more Authority in commanding Obedience, than Civil Powers have? Doubtleſs you do believe him to have more Authority, or elſe, why do ſo many of your Church refuſe to take the *Oath of Allegiance*, which yet you † allow to be a lawful Oath? for you ſay, they refuſe it, *not for any unlawfulneſs in the Oath, but becauſe the Doctrine of Depoſing Princes is therein called Heretical, which they cannot allow of, as the word is underſtood in a Catholick ſenſe* (where you will allow me to obſerve, that for the true notion of Hereſie, you depend on the *Pope*'s *Breve*, and ſo allow the *Pope* to be a Judge in matters of *Faith*, for Hereſie is contrary to the *Faith*, and conſequently the *Depoſing Power*, which the *Pope* hath determin'd, is a matter of *Faith*) and why do they follow the *Papal* Dictates in thoſe things, wherein by the Laws of God, and Nations they are bound to ſubmit to their Superiours?

* Refl. p. 16.

† *Cath. princ. ſect.* 2. § 4. p. 3.

Here alſo I obſerve, that when * you Treat of the *Pope*'s Power, you give your ſelf a great latitude, when you ſay, That *you never ſcruple to receive his Decrees, and Definitions, ſuch as are iſſued forth by his Authority, with all their due Circumſtances,*

* *Popery miſ. repreſented*, p. 45.

and according to Law; but never tell us, what thoſe *Circumſtances* are (as your Adverſary well remarks) which puts me in *mind* of ſomewhat, which *your* * *Authors* ſay concerning the *Bull* of *Sixtus* 5. prefixt to his Edition of the *Vulgar Tranſlation*, which was afterward recalled by *Clement* 8. *That it was true the Bull was printed with the Bible, but that it was not affixt to the Gates of St.* Peter's *Church, and in the* Campo fiore *ſo long, as it ought to have been according to the Laws of the Romiſh Chancery*, as if ſuch little things as thoſe made Eccleſiaſtical Decrees more, or leſs valid.

* *Tanner diſp. 1. de fid. q. 4. dub. 6. n. 263. Compton. in 22. diſ. 22. § 5.*

And now to ſhew you, that your *Anſwerer* did not ſhow his Learnlng in diſcovering, that the *Popes have diſpenc't only with poſitive Inſtitutions, but not with the Moral Law, with Lying*, and *Forſwearing*, (as if he ſought a knot in a Bull-ruſh, and *took Sanctuary in a Myſtery*, as you term it, by talking only in general terms) what think you of the many Diſpenſations, that have been given by former *Popes* to the Subjects of this, and other Kingdoms, to break their *Oaths of Allegiance*, and Duty to their Soveraigns? (the relation between Princes, and their Subjects, being not grounded on their being *Chriſtians*, but on the Obligation of *Civil Society*, ſo that a diſpenſing with the *Oath of Allegiance*, is a diſpenſing with a Duty of Natural Religion, which binds Subjects to obey their Superiours.) For either Subjection to Princes is a Duty of the Fifth Commandment, (as we reckon them) *Honour thy Father, and Mother*, &c. or it is not; if it be not, you will do well to affert it, and we ſhall take care to prove it to be a Duty of that Commandment, not only

only from the Authority of the Antients, and from Reaſon, but from the Authority of your own *Catechiſm*, which † ſays, *That all perſons, who are poſſeſſors of power, or dignity, are included under the term Parents*, which is afterward explain'd by *thoſe, who have Empire, Magiſtracy, or power committed to them, who govern the Commonwealth.* But if to obey Princes be a duty of that Commandment, then to diſpence with that duty, is to *diſpence with a Moral Law*, and to diſpence with Oaths, that bind to that duty, is to give men a diſpenſation to be perjur'd, and to forſwear themſelves. And becauſe you tell us *, *That the Papiſt is taught in all Books, that to Lye is a ſin, and to call God to witneſs to an untruth, is damnable, and that the practices of your Church are according to thoſe preſcriptions, and that neither the Sacrament, nor an Oath of Secrecy can excuſe any man from perjury*; *nor did you ever hear of any ſuch thing from any Prieſts in Sermons, or Confeſſions, never read of them in your Books, or Catechiſms, nor ſaw the practice of any of them in any of your Communion*;) in which words there is ſome Art uſed; for, do you believe, that any Prieſt of your Communion may reveal what he hears in confeſſion againſt the Laws of your Church, which bind him to Secrecy *ſub ſigillo*? and when you tell us, *You never read of any ſuch thing either in Books, or Catechiſms*, you mean, I ſuppoſe, Books of Devotion; for in other Books, you may undoubtedly read ſuch Doctrines, or elſe why ſhould the *Pope* condemn them? And when you ſay, *You never ſaw any ſuch thing*, I hope you mean, it never fell within the reach of your particular obſervation; but if you read the account of Mr. *Garnet*, and his accomplices, you will find, that they took the Sacrament

† *Part.* 3. *prac.* 4. § 3. & 11. c. § 17, 18.

* *Pap. repræſent. p.* 47, 48.

ment as an Oath of Secrecy, to carry on that Helliſh deſign.) And withal ſubjoyn, * *That the preſent Pope hath condemn'd all Equivocations, and Mental Reſervations under the penalty of Excommunication* latæ ſententiæ *by his Decree* March 2. 1679. We do ſtill averr, that your Church hath given diſpenſations for Lying, and Forſwearing, and we know not, but it may be done for the future. For, not to inſtance in the *Jeſuite Moraliſts* †, *Filiutius*, *Sanches*, &c. their averring, *That if a man promiſes any thing, and ſwears to it, yet if he do not intend it, he may without ſin break that promiſe, and that Oath*; ſo that the intention of the Swearer among theſe *Caſuiſts*, makes the Oath valid, as the intention of the Prieſt makes the Sacrament. Some other of the *ſame Order*, have given diſpenſations for the breach of the Moral Law*; *Eſcobar* ſays poſitively, *virtute bullæ poteſt votum non peccandi mutari*, i. e. *that a man may break his Vow of not ſinning by virtue of a Bull*, and he inſtances in the committing of *Fornication*; he † alſo ſays, That a man may Lye even to his Confeſſor, that *a man may promiſe a general Confeſſion, and yet not confeſs all his mortal ſins*, quia quamvis mentiatur, id tamen parum refert ad Confeſſarii judicium, i. e. *for tho he Lye, yet that hath little or no relation to the Judgment of his Confeſſor.*

* *Ib. p. 66.*

† *Filiut. tr. 2. tr. 25. n. 325. Sanches opir. moral. l. 3. c. 10. n. 7. & 8.*

* *Theol. mor. tr. 1. l. 7 c. 20. n. 281, &c.*

† *Tr. 7. ex. 4. n. 118.*

Now to theſe proofs probably you will object, that this is not the Opinion of the Church, but of private men; to which I anſwer, that had it not been the Opinion of your Church, when thoſe Books were written, ſuch men would never have been allowed to be *Confeſſors* (which no man can be unleſs by the allowance of the *Pope*, the

the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, &c.) though it is well known, that the *Jeſuits* then were, and ſtill are as Eminent for being *Confeſſors*, as any other Order in your Communion, and perhaps more, and this notwithſtanding their owning theſe *damnable Doctrines*, as both you, and I agree to call them. Nor is it enough to ſay, that the Book of *Eſcobar*, after having been 39 times printed for an excellent Book (which is an argument, it was much bought, and much valued) was the 40th time printed only to be cenſured, and condemn'd by the *French* Biſhops (which the poor *Janſeniſts* lookt upon to have been a condemnation both of the Author, and his Opinions, whereas they found at laſt to their coſt, that themſelves were cenſured at *Rome*, as the criminals) nor that the preſent *Pope* (being more wiſe, and moderate than ſome of his Predeceſſors) hath condemn'd thoſe Doctrines (which vindicates us, that we have not unjuſtly charg'd the men of your Church with ſuch Doctrines) among which propoſitions if you conſult the 26 and 27, it is aſſerted, *That a man may either, being askt, or of his own accord ſay, and ſwear, that he did not do a thing, which he really did, and yet by vertue of a ſecret meaning, be neither a lyar, nor perjured. And that this he may do, as often as it is neceſſary, or profitable to ſave his Body, Honour, or Eſtate, or for any other good end.* For this is to acknowledge, that your Church for a long time heretofore conniv'd at, or allow'd of the breach of plain moral commandments, ſince the man in authority, that doth not prohibit the ſin, that he may hinder, ſeems to injoyn it. I alſo obſerve,

1. That

1. That according to your Opinion, whatever the *Pope*, and *Cardinals*, or other Biſhops do either allow, or condemn, is not binding as to the *Faith*, ſince the infallibility is lodg'd no where, but in a *general Council*. 2. If we look into the *Cenſure*, there is nothing relating to the breach of Oaths given to Princes, which is the higheſt truſt in temporal matters, and withal, that the propoſitions are not condemn'd as contrary to the Laws of God, and Nature, as aſſertions, that promote impiety, and injuſtice; but *ut minimùm tanquam ſcandaloſas, & praxi perniciosas*, [which is the manner of expreſſion that *Alexander* 7. makes uſe of in his *cenſure*, *An.* 1665.] *as at leaſt ſcandalous, and pernicious to practice*, and therefore to be condemn'd, which whether this doth not look like a *trick*, and *juggle* (becauſe you have encouraged me to uſe the word) you your ſelf ſhall be the judge; for notwithſtanding this *cenſure*, whenever the ſcandal ceaſes (which no one knows, how ſoon that may be) and they are judg'd no longer pernicious, the propoſitions may be again owned, and maintained. 3. It is moreover obſervable, that whereas former *Popes* have allowed theſe Tenents, and Practices without condemning them, who knows, but the Succeſſors of the preſent *Pope* may, when they pleaſe, licence anew the propoſitions, which are now condemn'd? 4. That ſome ſuch thing hath been formerly done, your * Adverſary hath given you an inſtance, which you did not think fit to meddle with, nor to reflect upon, out of *Archbiſhop Abbot's* † *Preface to his ſix Lectures*, " where you will find, that *Pius* 5. the ſame *Pope*, " who authoriz'd the *Trent-Catechiſm*, gave his reſo- " lution to ſome of the *Engliſh Miſſionaries*, that " whenever

* Ch. 26. m. p. 90.

† P. 11.

" whenever any of them were called before a judge in " *England, he might either refuse the Oath, or Swear, and* " *answer ſophiſtically, poteſt Catholicus tractus coram hæ-reticis vel recuſare juramentum* (*quod eſt prudentius*) *vel ſophiſticè jurare, & ſophiſticè reſpondere ſuis inter-rogationibus.* And if you look into the Book called *Foxes*, and *Firebrands*, you will ſee there, that *Heath* the *Jeſuit* had a *Bull* with him dated *An.* 1. of the ſame *Pius* 5. allowing him to preach what Doctrine the *Society of the Jeſuits* ſhould order him for the dividing of the *Proteſtants*, and not to inſtance in the diſpenſation given by *Eugenius* 4. and his *Legate Card. Julian* to *Ladiſlaus King* of *Hungary* to break his League with the *Grand Signior*, for which he was ſo ſeverely puniſht in the unfortunate Battel of *Varna*, and ſome other ſuch examples, the Examination of Mr. *Garnet* is a very plain proof of this our aſſertion; for though ſome men call theſe little arts *equivocation*, and *mental reſervation*, as if they were ſmall, or no ſins, yet you fairly, and honeſtly condemn both alike, and I know few wiſe, and good men, but look upon both as alike ſinful, and perhaps the *equivocation* the more ſo, becauſe the deſign is more cunningly laid to deceive.

And now I am talking of the *Jeſuits*, I think fit to mind you, that whereas you ſeem to ſay, * that it is a ſcandal upon your Church to affirm, that 'tis more lawful to be drunk on a Faſting day, than to eat fleſh, I have met with a *Caſuiſt* † of your communion, who will not allow a man to eat Fleſh on a Faſting day, but as to drink gives great indulgence, when he ſays, *that a man may drink Wine even in great quantity*, and if he happen to be drunk, *in-*

* *Pap. miſrepr.* p. 69, 70.

† *Eſtobar.* tr. 1. ex. 13. n. 74, 75.

1. That according to your Opinion, whatever the *Pope*, and *Cardinals*, or other Biſhops do either allow, or condemn, is not binding as to the *Faith*, ſince the infallibility is lodg'd no where, but in a *general Council*. 2. If we look into the *Cenſure*, there is nothing relating to the breach of Oaths given to Princes, which is the higheſt truſt in temporal matters, and withal, that the propoſitions are not condemn'd as contrary to the Laws of God, and Nature, as aſſertions, that promote impiety, and injuſtice; but *ut minimùm tanquam ſcandaloſas, & praxi perniciosas*, [which is the manner of expreſſion that *Alexander* 7. makes uſe of in his *cenſure*, *An.* 1665.] *as at leaſt ſcandalous, and pernicious to practice*, and therefore to be condemn'd, which whether this doth not look like a *trick*, and *juggle* (becauſe you have encouraged me to uſe the word) you your ſelf ſhall be the judge; for notwithſtanding this *cenſure*, whenever the ſcandal ceaſes (which no one knows, how ſoon that may be) and they are judg'd no longer pernicious, the propoſitions may be again owned, and maintained. 3. It is moreover obſervable, that whereas former *Popes* have allowed theſe Tenents, and Practices without condemning them, who knows, but the Succeſſors of the preſent *Pope* may, when they pleaſe, licence anew the propoſitions, which are now condemn'd? 4. That ſome ſuch thing hath been formerly done, your * Adverſary hath given you an inſtance, which you did not think fit to meddle with, nor to reflect upon, out of *Archbiſhop Abbot's* † *Preface to his ſix Lectures*, " where you will find, that *Pius* 5. the ſame *Pope*, " who authoriz'd the *Trent-Catechiſm*, gave his reſo- " lution to ſome of the *Engliſh Miſſionaries*, that " whenever

* Ch. 26. m. P. 90.

† P. 11.

"whenever any of them were called before a judge in "*England*, he might either refuse the Oath, or Swear, and "answer ſophiſtically, poteſt Catholicus tractus coram hæreticis vel recuſare juramentum (quod eſt prudentius) vel ſophiſticè jurare, & ſophiſticè reſpondere ſuis interrogationibus. And if you look into the Book called *Foxes*, and *Firebrands*, you will ſee there, that *Heath* the *Jeſuit* had a *Bull* with him dated *An.* 1. of the ſame *Pius* 5. allowing him to preach what Doctrine the *Society of the Jeſuits* ſhould order him for the dividing of the *Proteſtants*, and not to inſtance in the diſpenſation given by *Eugenius* 4. and his *Legate Card. Julian* to *Ladiſlaus King* of *Hungary* to break his League with the *Grand Signior*, for which he was ſo ſeverely puniſht in the unfortunate Battel of *Varna*, and ſome other ſuch examples, the Examination of Mr. *Garnet* is a very plain proof of this our aſſertion; for though ſome men call theſe little arts *equivocation*, and *mental reſervation*, as if they were ſmall, or no ſins, yet you fairly, and honeſtly condemn both alike, and I know few wiſe, and good men, but look upon both as alike ſinful, and perhaps the *equivocation* the more ſo, becauſe the deſign is more cunningly laid to deceive.

And now I am talking of the *Jeſuits*, I think fit to mind you, that whereas you ſeem to ſay, * that it is a ſcandal upon your Church to affirm, that 'tis more lawful to be drunk on a Faſting day, than to eat fleſh, I have met with a *Caſuiſt* † of your communion, who will not allow a man to eat Fleſh on a Faſting day, but as to drink gives great indulgence, when he ſays, *that a man may drink Wine even in great quantity*, and if he happen to be drunk, *immoderatio*

* *Pap. miſrepr.* p. 69, 70.

† *Eſtobar. tr.* 1. *ex.* 13. *n.* 74, 75.

moderatio poteſt temperantiam violare, ſed non jejunium
He may tranſgreſs the Laws of Temperance, but he does not tranſgreſs the Laws of Faſting.

After this I will not decide the controverſy between your Adverſary, and your ſelf, whether the ſtory of S. *Perpetua*'s Viſion be ſeriouſly related, or droll'd on (who pay a great veneration to all Antient writings, and can hardly think, that a Martyr in view of an Eternal Crown of happineſs would indulge to any thing, that is light, or deſerves to be expoſed) but I have ſome things to ſay relating to that Viſion. As, 1. That it is very probably believed by moſt learned men, that *SS. Perpetua*, and *Felicitas* were *Montaniſts*, among whom there were many *viſions*, which the reſt of the World gave no credit to; but this I ſhall not diſpute. But, 2. I averr, that it is very diſputable both from the *viſion* it ſelf, and from the quotations in St. *Auſtin*, whether *Dinocrates* were baptiz'd, or no. I know, your † Adverſary ſays, he was baptized, and St. *Auſtin* would fain have it ſo, but there is no convincing proof, that he was ſo; and the ſilence of the Writer of *that Paſſion* ſeems to imply, that he was not ſo. Now then I urge you with this *Dilemma*, either *Dinocrates* was baptiz'd, or not; if he were not baptiz'd, (as it is very probable, becauſe his Father was a very violent Heathen, and ſo in all likelihood would not ſuffer his Son, being ſo young, to be baptiz'd) then you have nothing to do with him in *Purgatory*; for, tho you have allotted an appartment there for the unbaptiz'd Children of Chriſtian Parents, yet you allow no place there to the unbaptiz'd Children of *Heathen* Parents, who with their

† Chap. 23. p. 84.

Pagan

Pagan Progenitors are condemn'd to Hell; unleſs we muſt reckon this ſtory with thoſe other of St. *Thecla*'s bringing the Soul of *Falconilla* out of Hell, or St. *Gregory*'s praying thence the Emperour *Trajan*, which later ſtory the * *Jews*, who themſelves allow of a ſort of *Purgatory*, make ſport of; but if he he were baptiz'd, (as I profeſs, I cannot believe, tho St. *Auſtin* ſays ſo) then it ſeems very hard, that a Child of ſeven years old, (when few Children are capable of underſtanding enough to chuſe to be wicked) ſhould be ſent to *Purgatory* for ſins, which he knew not of; for if that be true, which St. *Auſtin* ſays, that his Father probably carryed him to the Heathen Temples, as we will ſuppoſe it to be, this was the Father's ſin, and not the Child's, and ſo I cannot ſee, why *Dinocrates* ſhould be puniſht.

* *Muller. præf. ad Evang. S. Matth. Heb. p. 10.*

And to confirm my conjecture, that he was not baptiz'd, I am apt to think, that in the Viſion the Water, * which *Perpetua* ſaw her Brother endeavouring to drink of, but could not come at, was an Emblem of the Waters of *Baptiſm*, which he ſeem'd to endeavour after, and at laſt *Perpetua* her ſelf ſays *, that ſhe her ſelf was a *Catechumen*, when ſhe was apprehended, and that at that time ſhe had two Brethren both *Catechumens*; now if we reckon *Dinocrates* for one of thoſe two Brethren of hers, or allow him to be dead ſome time before, (as I rather conjecture) I am ſtrongly inclined to believe, that while the Father was an obſtinate *Pagan*, the Siſter, and the other Brothers only *Catechumens*, that this younger Son, who was but ſeven years old when he died, was not baptiz'd, before he went out of the World; now if he were not baptiz'd, the Fathers

* *Paſſ. ſ. Perp. p. 15. Ed. Oxon.*

* *Ib. p. 5.*

tell you, there was no hopes of Salvation for him; for to omit St. *Austin*, and the *African Fathers*, I will only instance in two remarkable passages, the one for the *Western* Church out of * *Gennadius*, *Nullum Catechumenum, &c. That no Catechumen, tho he die in a state of good works* (which is more than St. *Austin* says of *Dinocrates*, for he accuses him of Idolatry) *can attain to Eternal life, unless he be a Martyr.* And for the *Eastern* Church out of St. *Chrysostom* †, κλαῦσον τοὺς χωρὶς φωτίσματος ἀπερχομένους καὶ θ' ἐξ. *Mourn over those, who leave the world without Baptism; they deserve your sighs, and lamentations; they are out of the Kingdom of God among the unrighteous, and the condemn'd.*

* *De Dog. Eccl. c. 74.*

† *To. 4. λόγγ. in Ep. ad Phi. p. 20.*

And now if all your former Arguments will not make us Converts, you tell us, * that *if a man assent to these Articles, as you have stated them, he shall have admittance into your Church*, and probably so, for we know, you deal very gently with your new Converts, till you have secured them; but who knows how much further he must go, when he is under new Oaths of Obedience to that Church, who makes her *unwritten Traditions* (which no man knows, till she reveals them) to be as much the *Rule of Faith and Manners*, as the *Holy Scriptures*, and consequently binds all her followers to an *Implicit Faith* to believe, whatever she shall reveal? And I remember, that Mr. *Cambden* † records a report, that once there were more easie terms of Reconciliation proposed by the *Pope's Nuncio*, viz. the allowance of the *Sacrament in both kinds*, and the confirmation of the *English Lyturgy*, and probably many other things, so the *Papal Supremacy* were acknowledged; but we are very

* *Refl. p. ult.*

* *Annal. an. 1560.*

" very well ſatisfied, that St. Peter had no more Au-
" thority, than the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, and that
" every Biſhop by Divine Right, is a Succeſſor of the
" *Apoſtles*, and conſequently hath equal power in the
" Church of *Chriſt*; that the making more Sacra-
" ments, than we are ſure *Chriſt* inſtituted, is an en-
" croachment upon his Right, (and that the eſtabliſh-
" ment of your five additional Sacraments, is ſuch an
" encroachment) that the *Jewiſh* Canon of the Old
" Teſtament (the *Jews*, till our bleſſed Saviour's time,
" being the only True Church of God) with the un-
" controverted Books of the New, are the only di-
" vinely inſpired Oracles, and a ſufficient *Rule of*
" *Faith, and Manners*, without the help of the *Apo-*
" *crypha*, or of unwritten *Traditions*; that General
" *Councils* are not infallible, much leſs the *Pope*, either
" ſingly, or with the Colledge of *Cardinals*; that gi-
" ving the Communion in one kind, is robbing the
" people of what our Saviour gave them a right to;
" and that Prayers in an unknown Tongue are a con-
" tradiction to St. *Paul*; with many other ſuch points,
which it is now needleſs to mention, for which rea-
ſon the Members of the *Church of England* think fit to
continue, where they are, where they enjoy all the
forementioned bleſſings, with many others, which
muſt neceſſarily be forfeited, when they embrace the
Romiſh Communion.

Thus have I curſorily taken notice of your *Reflections* in whatever *material points*, you have thought fit to ſpeak to, except that very weighty, and *moſt material point* of the power of *Depoſing Princes*, the thorow conſideration of which, was the firſt cauſe of my preſent undertaking. Now you encounter your

Adverſaries

Adverſaries *Golath-Argument* (as you ſeen in ſcorn to call it, as *Card. Bellarmine in the Præface to his Anſwer to Barclay* ſays, that writing in defence of *Princes*, *Barclay* came out like *Goliah*, to defie all the Armies of *Iſrael*) with this diſtinction *, that *in all Councils there are ſome Articles of Faith, which all Catholicks receive, and ſome Conſtitutions, and Decrees relating to Diſcipline, and Government, which are not abſolutely obligatory*, (ſo that I perceive, that in ſome ſort, and upon ſome conſiderations, thoſe other Conſtitutions, and Decrees relating to Diſcipline, and Government, are obligatory, *i. e.* upon condition, tho not abſolutely) and withal, you tell us as freely, that if the *Depoſing Doctrine had been as evidently declared in former Councils, as ever Purgatory, or Tranſubſtantiation were in that of* Trent, *yet with you it ſhould be no Article of Faith.* Which way of arguing (tho it be very generous) ſeems to me to deſtroy your diſtinction of matters of *Faith*, and matters of *Diſcipline*; for if the *Lateran Council* had defin'd the *Depoſing Doctrine* as a matter of *Faith*, and requir'd the belief of it under the penalty of an *Anathema*, as the *Trent-Council* did *Purgatory*, and *Tranſubſtantiation*, then either you muſt have believ'd, as the *Council* required, or elſe in matters of Faith defin'd by a *general Council* a man may think himſelf not bound to believe them; and if ſo, I ſee no other reaſon, why any other man may not as well refuſe to believe *Purgatory*, and *Tranſubſtantiation* upon your own principles. But if we allow of your diſtinction in your own ſenſe, I ſuppoſe, you will hardly allow another man to make the like deductions, and think himſelf at Liberty to follow his own dictates, for, if ſo, then the *half communion*, *Prieſts Marriages*, *Prayers in Latin*, *the Popes Supremacy*, and many other ſuch

* Refl. p. 9.

points

points being matters of *Diſcipline*, every man by parity of reaſon may give himſelf a diſpenſation to believe contrary to the definitions of *Councils*, if you allow your ſelf a liberty to believe the Princes cannot be depoſed, though it were defin'd as matter of *Faith* in a *general Council*. And it is remarkable, that for the better underſtanding of this diſtinction you recommend * *Card. Bellarmine* to us, who, I am ſure, makes the *Popes perſonal infallibility, his ſuperiority to a general Council, and his power of depoſing Princes matters of Faith*,

* Refl. p. 10.

But to allow of your diſtinction between *matters of Doctrine, and matters of Diſcipline*, and that in *matters of Faith* from the definitions of a *general Council*, no man ought to vary, but in *matters of Diſcipline*, though defined by the ſame *Cooncil*, a man is left at liberty; pray, tell me ſeriouſly, is every man left at liberty, or ſome men only? If every man, then the aſſertors of the *Depoſing Doctrine* have as much right on their ſide, as you have, (for the *private ſpirit* is not to be your guide in your Church any more, than in ours, and the aſſertors of that *depoſing power* have *Councils* on their ſide, and *Popes*, and many private Doctors) and if you tell me, that you are not to follow your own prudence, but the Doctors of the Church, where you live, in what a *general Council* hath not decided as *matters of Faith*, then you muſt change Opinions with the climate, you live in (as *Pere Cotton* ſaid of himſelf, that in *France* he believ'd a *general Council* to be above the *Pope*, but in *Italy*, that the *Pope* was above a *general Council*) for if you inquire in *France*, whence, I ſuppoſe, you have your principles, as well as your arguments, they will tell you now, that the *Pope* hath

hath no ſuperiority over Kings, and that they have condemn'd *Sanctarellus* his book, and burnt *Mariana*'s; but if you inquire in the Neighbouring Countries, they will tell you the contrary; it is well known, what the belief of *Italy* is in this point; and for *Spain*, the *Inquiſition* at *Toledo*, *Jan* 10. 1683. condemn'd the late cenſure of the *Sorbon*; and in the *Low-countries D'Enghien a Profeſſor of Louvaine* hath written in defence of the *Popes power over Princes* againſt *Natalis Alexander*, and poſitively averrs, that the *French* Opinion is either *Hereſie*, or *next to Hereſie*, and that more Authors in your Church aſſert, than deny the *Depoſing Doctrine* (the preſent Pope urging that, and ſeveral other *Univerſities* to cenſure the *Decrees* of the *French Aſſembly*, *An.* 1682. Among whom it is obſervable, that the *Univerſity* of *Doway* prayed the *King* of *France*, their new Maſter, to whom they were lately made Subjects) that he would not force them to change their Doctrine, leſt they ſhould be accuſed of taking up a new Theology with a new Soveraign) and if you go into *Hungary*, the *Clergy* there alſo condemn'd the Doctrine of the *French Biſhops* as erroneous, and ſchiſmatical *Oct.* 24. 1682. and when the *Arch-Biſhop of Gran*, *the* Primate *of lower Hungary* wrote againſt the Propoſitions of the ſaid *French Aſſembly*, an order was given to the *Sorbon* to cenſure the *Arch-Biſhop*'s Book, which they refuſed to do, but upon this condition, that they might be allowed to condemn the propoſitions, as if extracted out of ſome other Author, which looks like a fine fetch of Sophiſtry. And now, †*Where is three times the number, who diſown this Doctrine of depoſing to them, that own it*, as you ſay? Whereas, beſides what hath been above mention'd,

V. d'Engoien. p. 549. *&c. & Jucieu. Calviniſme, & Papiſme mis en parallel. to.* 2. *part.* 3. *ch.* 3.

† *Pap. miſrep. p.* 50.

mention'd, the *Author of the firſt Treatiſe againſt the* "*Oath of Allegiance*, p. 13. ſays, that the *Depoſing Do-* "*ctrine* hath been the common received Doctrine of "all School-divines, Caſuiſts, and Canoniſts, from "firſt to laſt (afore *Calvin*'s time) in the ſeveral Na- "tions of *Chriſtendom*, yea even in *France* it ſelf, and "even there of thoſe *French Divines*, that were moſt "eager for their Temporal Princes againſt the *Pope*, "as *Occam*, *Almain*, *Joh. Pariſienſis*, *Gerſon*, &c.

And is it not an argument of the great care, which your Church hath taken of the Perſons and Intereſts of Princes (which are ſacred) that every Writer of your Church, whether Prieſt, or Lay-man, ſhall have liberty freely to publiſh his thoughts about the rights of Soveraigns, and whether their Subjects, or the *Pope* may depoſe them? As if the Doctrine of Obedience to Superiors were ſuch a ſlight indifferent thing, that a man may with ſafety to his Religion, and Conſcience believe, either that the *Pope* may, or may not abſolve Subjects from their Obedience. A wiſe man would think, that there were a greater neceſſity to define ſuch a point (upon which the ſafety of Kings, and their Kingdoms depends) than to define the preciſe manner of our bleſſed Saviour's preſence in the Sacrament, which had it never been defin'd (while all Chriſtians acknowledge him to be there) might have been the occaſion of much peace and happineſs to *Chriſtendom*. And if you plead, that ſome men among us have aſſerted the *Depoſing Doctrine*, to this your * Adverſary hath given you a full anſwer. For until you can ſhow, that our *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops*, and inferior Clergy in *Convocation* have owned any ſuch Doctrine, or countenanc't ſuch men in aſſerting it, you ſay nothing to the purpoſe; for we damn the Do-

* Ch. 20. p. 75.

 ctrine,

ctrine, by whomſoever vented, and our ſuperiors are ready to cenſure the aſſertors of it, if they durſt appear openly. Nor is it enough to ſay, *that this hath been done by the French Clergy*, which is equivalent to an act of our *Convocation*; for the agreement will not hold, becauſe the diſpute is not between the *Engliſh*, and the *French* Church, but between the Church of *England*, and the *Roman-Catholick* Church in this point; now we averr, that the whole Church of *England* damns, and diſowns *the Doctrine of Depoſing*, but you tell us, that only a part of your *Catholick Church* doth ſo too, whereas a far greater part own, and defend it; we aſſert, that it is Hereſie to own the Doctrine, but you dare not give it that name, leſt you offend *his Holineſs*.

Nay, it is plain from experience, that ſo far are the *Pope*, and the great men of your Church from condemning the *Depoſing Doctrine*, that thoſe few men among you, that have been ſo juſt, and ſtout, as to aſſert the rights of Princes, have fallen under the Church *Cenſures*, of which I need quote no more inſtances, than *Widdington* of old, and *F. Barnes* (if he be yet alive) and *F. Welſh* at this preſent Excommunicate for affirming it to be the Duty of Subjects to Swear *Allegiance* to their Prince, and to defend him even againſt the *Pope* himſelf, and all his *Cenſures*; whereas we daily ſee the aſſertors of the *Depoſing Doctrine* not only live, and dye in your Communion without Cenſure, but to be the moſt thriving men, and the ſooneſt preferr'd to dignities. So very true is that ſaying of * *Marcus Ant. de Dominis Archbiſhop of* Spalato, *that the* Pope, *and his followers are not pleaſed with anything ſo much, as with the rendring the power of Kings, vile, weak, and contemptible*, to which I will add, and the expoſing all, who defend it. And

* *Offenſ. rr. Suarez. c. 3. n. 1. p. 918. ad cali. to. 2. de rep. Eccl.*

And to convince you, that you your self have not that venerable Opinion of the Majesty of Princes, and the Duty, which their Subjects owe them, as you ought, I cannot but observe, that you not only tell us,* *that it is a disputed point among your Doctors* (as if it were one of those *School-points*, which you mention p. 72. *which may be maintain'd this way, or that way, without any breach of Faith, or injury to Religion*) but withal, that whereas upon every other head of Doctrine, or Discipline, that you represent, you are frequent in quotations out of holy Scripture to prove your assertions (how pertinently applyed, your Adversary hath consider'd) upon this head of the *deposing power* (as also when you treat of it more largely than of any other thing in your * *Roman Catholick principles*, if that Book be yours) you quote not one text against Rebellion, you confess, that Rebellion against a Prince is *contrary to the Fundamental Laws of the Nation, injurious to Soveraign power, destructive to peace, and Government, and by consequence in his Majesties Subjects impious, and damnable* (where I shall not take notice of your limitation of the proposition to his Majesties Subjects, which hath no relation at all to the question, *whether the Subjects of an Heretical Prince*, as you account him, may not take up Arms against him) but why do not you speak out, and say it is *directly impious and damnable?* (if you will not say, it is *Heretical*) being against an express Law of God, that binds you to obey (even a *Nero*, or a *Dioclesian*) * *not only for wrath, but for conscience sake*; that tells you, that † *no man* (upon any pretence whatsoever) *can lift up his hand against the Lords anointed, and be guiltless*. For by your way of arguing, if the *Fundamental Laws* of a Nation may be secured by such a Rebellion (and you know, the pretence

* *Pap. repres.*] p. 50.

* Sect. 2. § 4. p. 3.

* Rom. 13. 5.

† 1 Sam. 26. 9.

 of

of all Rebels is *Liberty*, and *Property*) and the *Government duly ſetled, peace promoted*, and the *Soveraign power, i. e.* the Monarchy *not injured*, though a particular Monarch may be (and yet your *Depoſing Divines* ſay, that it is no injury to an Heretical Prince to depoſe him, but a juſt Execution of the Laws) then a Rebellion may be lawful. But upon the principles of the Church of *England*, if all theſe things could be ſecured, yet no man can be a Rebel, but he muſt be damn'd, becauſe the Laws of God forbid Rebellion, taking up Arms againſt a Prince, or endeavouring to depoſe him; for as long as the word of God ſtands firm, and the above-cited texts, with many others, are not blotted out of our Bibles, we think it directly damnable (and not only *by conſequence*, as you do) to take Arms againſt our Soveraign, let his Religion be what it will.

So that, upon the whole, I cannot but ask you, while you have endeavoured to prove *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *&c.* from both *Scripture*, and *Fathers*, how happens it, that in the defence of the *Rights* of *Princes*, you quote neither? eſpecially, when you cannot but remember, that the Aſſertors of the *Pope's Temporal Monarchy*, and *his power over Princes*, are frequent in their doughty arguments from *holy Scripture*, ſuch as, *God made two great Lights*; *behold, here, are two Swords*; *Feed my ſheep*; *riſe*, Peter, *kill, and eat*, &c. and is there no place to be found in all the ſacred Oracles, that forbids Rebellion, and requires Obedience? does not that inſpired Book injoyn all Chriſtians *, *to render to* Cæſar *the things, that are* Cæſar's, and † *to ſubmit to every ordinance of Man for the Lord's ſake*; and if you are a Prieſt, are you not requir'd to teach others ſo to do *? to *put them in mind to be ſubject to principalities*,

* Mat. 22. 21.
† 1 Pet. 2. 13.
* Titus 3. 1.

ties, and powers, to obey Magiſtrates, and to be ready to every good work? Is there alſo nothing in the *Fathers*, that looks this way? doth not *Tertullian* ſay, that *a Prince is inferiour only to God?* doth not *Irenæus* aver, *that by the ſame power that men are made, are Princes conſtituted?* Doth not *Origen* tell *Celſus*, that *among the Chriſtians he ſhould not find any act of ſedition, or tumult*, (notwithſtanding all their preſſures, and perſecutions) and doth not St. *Ambroſe* ſay to the Emperor, *we intreat thee, O Prince, we do not fight?* not to multiply quotations.

And, before I leave this head, I cannot but remark, that whereas the * *Trent Catechiſm* allows, that *Emperors*, and *Magiſtrates* are called *Fathers*, and ſo are included in the Commandment, (*Honour thy Father, &c.*) which is more, than you acknowledge, yet they quote no place of *Scripture* to make this good, but the Hiſtory of *Naaman*, (*ſic Naaman à famulis pater vocabatur*) where his Servants call him *Father*, which does not look like fair dealing, for the Example does not reach the Doctrine, unleſs the Fathers of that *Council* prævaricate, *Naaman* being a Subject to the King of *Syria*, whereas they might have found without much ſeeking, that * *David* calls *Saul, my Father*, who was his King; and in truth, the title was ſo proper to Princes, that the Kings of the *Philiſtim* were always called *Abimelech*, i.e. *my Father the King* by a general name, whatever their proper name was. Now I am loath to judg, that thoſe Fathers made uſe of an inſtance of a Subject called *Father* by his Servants, that the Example might limit the Doctrine to ſubjection to inferiour Magiſtrates, when, had they inſerted the Example of *David*, it would plainly have proved the Obedience of Subjects to Soveraign Princes.

* *Part. 3. præcep. 4. § 11.*

* *1 Sam. 24. 11.*

And

And whereas the Fathers of the ſame *Council*, who were concern'd in the *Catechiſm*, uſe to quote ſuch places of the *Antients*, as they thought pertinent to the Subject treated of, they having * quoted *Rom.* 13. 1. to prove that men ought to be obedient to the Higher Powers, confirm the Doctrine only by the teſtimony of *Tertullian*, (who it is true, ſpeaks plain, and to the purpoſe) omitting St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, and others on the place, who have told the World, that by *every Soul*, in St. *Paul*, are meant *Prieſts*, and *Biſhops*, as well as Laymen, nay the *Pope* himſelf, as ſays St. *Bernard*; but this probably would have unriddled the Myſtery, and expoſed a Doctrine, which they were not willing to diſown; the *Catechiſm*, like the *Canons*, leaving every man, in many ſuch things, a great latitude; ſo that in ſhort, I deſire you to anſwer this Queſtion; Either Rebellion is againſt a *Moral Law*, or not; if it be, then the *Pope* cannot diſpence with it, and then, how happens it, that ſo many things of leſſer moment were decided in the *Trent Council*, while this was forgotten, or paſt by? If it be not againſt a Moral Law, then by your own principles, the *Pope* may diſpence with it, and what then becomes of all Obedience, when another *Gregory* 7. or *Sixtus* 5. ſhall fill the Chair? And tho the *Council* would not condemn the *Depoſing Doctrine*, yet why had not the Authors of the *Index Expurgatorius* cenſured ſuch dangerous Books? for if we may judg of the ſenſe of the *Trent Council* by its *Catechiſm*, (tho made after the *Council* broke up) why may we not judg of its ſenſe by the *Index*, which was ordered to be made at the ſame time, *&c.* by the ſame men, who compoſed the *Catechiſm*? In which *Index* more than a few paſſages

* *Ibid.* § 17.

are

are expunged, that interfere with the Papal Grandeur, but not one poor ſentence condemn'd, that is deſtructive to the Rights of Princes.

Here alſo, pray, ſuffer me to mind you of a bold aſſertion of a private man, as you are, and which, I am ſure, as things are now, you cannot accompliſh *, for you undertake, that *all Roman Catholick Nations in the World ſhall ſubſcribe to the condemnation of all ſuch principles, and practices* (*i. e.* in your own words, of ſuch principles as *deſtroy the peace of Nations with Fires, and Maſſacres, and rob Soveraigns of their Crowns, and Subjects of their Liberties*) for I am ſure, there was a time, when all *Roman-Catholicks* were not of that mind, when the *League* was rampant againſt *Henry* 3. and 4. of *France*, in which one of them actually fell, and by the principles of which the other alſo was murthered; (not to mention, what the *Emperors Henry* 4. and 5. and our King *John* ſuffered) and when the *Pariſian*, and *Iriſh Maſſacres* were ſufficient proofs to the contrary. Nor is it poſſible, even now, to make good your promiſe, ſince I have told you already, what the belief of the *Spaniſh*, *Netherland*, and *Hungarian* Churches are in this point, beſides what the *Italians* hold.

* *Introd. p.* 11.

Now againſt all this Doctrine you have nothing to object, but that this Doctrine hath been condemn'd * in *France* by the *Eccleſiaſticks* there, and by the *Univerſities* of *Caen*, *Rhemes*, *Poictiers*, &c. all which *Univerſities* are within the one Kingdom of *France*; ſo that (tho there be no need of conſidering the Argument, becauſe it is only the ſentiment of *one National Church* againſt the reſt of what you call *Catholick Chriſtendom*) if I make it appear, that the *French* Church hath not always been of this belief,

* *Pap. miſrepr. p.* 51.

and

and perhaps is not so now, then all, that you say upon that *Topick*, will be far from proving your assertion; while withal I profess, that if what I am about to say doth not reach so far as a conviction, and be only a well-meant Essay, yet the cause, which I maintain ought not to be prejudiced by it, because the main position about the rights of Princes hath been already proved by other arguments, and authorities. And to evince this, I shall pursue the method which the famous * *Monsieur Jurieu* hath laid down, adding here, and there my own observations.

* *Calvinismi, & Papismi mis en parallele, part. 3. ch. 3.*

If therefore this be, and always hath been the Doctrine of the *Gallican* Church, then you have stated your argument aright, but if it hath not been always their belief, then the present *Gallican* Church may be as well mistaken, as the former, and if so, where is its authority? besides, if the *French* Church do condemn the Deposing Doctrine, and all the rest of the *Catholick* World do assert it, then the *Tradition* is not on the side of the *French* Church, though never defin'd as a matter of Faith by a *general Council*. Now to prove, that the *Deposing Doctrine* hath been the Opinion of the *Gallican* Church, I shall produce one remarkable instance, and that is, the deposition of *Childerick*, and the introducing of *Pepin* (*the first King of the second race*) into his Throne, and I shall briefly tell the story out of the *French* "*Historian*, that I have now by me, who relates, "that *Pepin* after his Conquest of the *Sarazins* did "so honour, and reverence the Clergy, and repair'd "so many of their Temples, that had been ruined, "that the most holy men of that time thought him "a Saint, whereupon aiming at the Crown, and "finding nothing stick in his way, but the Oath, "which

* *Girard. du Haillan de l'Estat, &c. l. 1. p. 66, &c.*

" which the *French* had given to their King, he ſent " to the *Pope* (whom he had before obliged) for " his diſpenſation (*Pepin* having already gained the " greateſt part of the *Nobility*, *Eccleſiaſtick's*, and " *Commons* to his party) the *Pope* readily granted a " diſpenſation, the *Clergy*, as well as the *Nobility*, " and *Commons* acquieſc't in what was done, ac- " knowledging *Pepin* for their rightful King, and " thruſting *Childerick* into a *Monaſtery*; and ſo do *Paulus Æmilius*, and others alſo relate the ſtory, and among them *Cardinal Perron*, and * *Monſieur Mezeray* ſays, that this was very likely done in that *general Aſſembly* held in *March*, *An.* 751. The *Biſhops* being there in great numbers, and *Boniface Arch-Biſhop* of *Mentz* in the head of them, who declared to the reſt of the Aſſembly the validity of the *Pope's* anſwer; and he intimates the reaſon, why they complied ſo readily with *Pepin*, becauſe he gave them a great ſhare in the Government.

* *Ch. Childric.* 3. *An.* 751.

It is true, what our *King* † *James* obſerves, that the elder *Hiſtorians*, *Ado Viennenſis*, *&c.* ſay, that the *States* had dethron'd *Childerick*, and only got the *Popes* conſent to it, and confirmation of it, and ſo does * *Mezeray*, and *Monſieur* † *Maimburge*, who is zealous in the caſe againſt the *Papal power* of *depoſing*; but which way ſoever *Childerick* were depoſed, his depoſition is a confirmation of what I undertake to prove; for if the *Pope* did it, and the *French Clergy* conſented, or the *three Eſtates* in *France* did it (of which the *Clergy* are the firſt) and the *Pope* conſented, it is all one, the matter of Fact being plain, that they both thought it lawful to depoſe their Prince (for a leſs crime than Hereſie) becauſe he was dull, and unfit for Government. And we alſo know,

† *Declaratio pro jurejur.* p. 19.

* *Ubi ſupr.*

† Prerogat. of the Church of *Rome*, and her Biſhops. ch. 29.

that when the Line of *Pepin* was laid aſide, and *Hugh Capet* (*the firſt King* of the *third Race*) came to the Crown, there was a right Heir of the *Carolovinian*, or *ſecond Race* of *Kings* alive, *viz. Charles Duke* of *Auſtratia*, or *Lorrain*, who was alſo laid aſide by the conſent of the *States*, of which the *Clergy* were the chiefeſt; it being * *Monſieur Mezeray*'s obſervations, that *Charles* of *Lorrain*, the laſt Male of the Line of *Pepin*, was deprived of the Crown, as *Childerick* had been; and the ſame † judicious *Hiſtorian* elſewhere gives an account, how it was done, that *Charles* being a Vaſſal to another King, and a ſtranger to his own Country, *Hugh Capet* being very powerful, and eſteemed, was Proclaimed King at *Noyon* in an Aſſembly of the Lords, and in a little while after Anointed, and Crowned by the *Archbiſhop* of *Rheims*, not one of thoſe, who were preſent at either Solemnity, claiming for *Charles*, but all giving their Oaths as well in writing, as by word of mouth to his Enemy; and when *Archbiſhop Arnold*, Brother to *Charles* was taken with him, the *Biſhops* of *France* Aſſembled in *Counsil* at *Rheims*, degraded him of his Prelature for breaking his Oath to *King Hugh*, whereas all his crime was the aſſiſting *Charles* of *Lorrain*, who was his lawful Prince.

* *Vb. ſupr. an.* 752.

† *Id. an.* 987.

But to come nearer home. In the time of the *League* it is very plain, that the *Eccleſiaſticks* generally declared for the *Leaguers*, and allowed of the depoſition of the two *Kings*, *Henry* 3. and 4. And whereas you may object, that ſome *Popiſh Biſhops*, and many of the *Popiſh Nobility* continued with *Henry* 3. to his death, and after that execrable parricide, with his Succeſſor *Henry* 4. yet *D'Avila*, the *Biſhop* of *Rhodez*, and * *Mezeray*, to name no other *Hiſtorians*, ſay, that after

* *An.* 1589.

" after that barbarous aſſaſſinate, the *Catholicks*, who " were the greater part of the Army, met, and, though " ſome few were for adhering to the King without " any conditions, yet the greateſt part thought them- " ſelves bound to *obſerve Divine, before humane Laws*, " (as they phras'd it) and at laſt both parties united " in one upon theſe terms, that they would declare " the *King* of *Navarre King* of *France* upon conditi- " on, that he would change his Religion, ſince it " would be ſtrange to their conſciences, and to the " whole Chriſtian World, that one ſhould be eſta- " bliſht *King* of *France*, who was no *Catholick*; where- " upon (many Prelates in the Camp declining even " this moderate courſe) the agreement was made by " a writing mutually ſigned, wherein the *King* ſwears, " and promiſes upon the word of a King, to cauſe " himſelf to be inſtructed in the *Catholick Reli-* " *gion* within ſix Months *&c.* and to maintain the " *Catholick Religion, &c.* and yet at laſt this did not " pleaſe all, but many went over to the *Leaguers*. Now here you ſee all the *Biſhops* of *France* (for they were all either of the party of the *League*, and it is not doubted, what their Opinion was, or of the *Court* party,) were of Opinion, that the *King* of *France* ſhould not be acknowledg'd, their rightful Soveraign, unleſs he declared for the *Roman Catholick* Religion, nor would his own party admit him, till he had ſo promiſt, and ſworn, as the *Leaguers* would not admit him, when he had ſo done; and this is worth the remembring, that his own party, thinking he would dally with them, ſet him a certain number of days, wherein to give them his reſolution; and in all their conferences with the *Leaguers*, the *Popiſh Lords*, who were Friends to *Henry* 4. made this their Apology. And

upon theſe terms, ſays *D'Avila*, the *Duke* of *Mayenne* himſelf promiſt by *Villeroy* his Agent to acknowledge him the *King* of *France*, though at the ſame time the *Pope's Legate*, and the *Sorbon* had made a *Decree*, that no agreement ſhould be made with the *Hereticks*, and particularly with *Henry* of *Bourbon* by which paſſage you may ſee, what was the Opinion of the Society of the *Sorbon* at that juncture, as by what elſe was done you may know the Opinion of the Prelates.

And further the *Biſhop* of *Rhodez* confeſſes, "That if "the *Duke* of *Mayenne* the head of the *Leaguers* had "upon the importunity of the *Pope*, &c. declared a- "nother *King* of *France*, upon that nomination there "was much appearance, and likelyhood, that all the "*Catholick Potentates* of *Chriſtendom* would have ac- "knowledg'd that King, whom the *States* ſhould have "Elected, that the *Clergy* would have done the like, "and the *Nobility*, and *People*, who followed not *Hen-* "*ry* 4. But becauſe he had the Title of *King*, and "would have made no conſcience to have quitted him "for another, to whom the *States* had granted it. And at laſt he ſubjoins, "That it was high time for "*Henry* 4. to enter into the boſom of the Church, or "to reſolve on a War, of which poſſibly he might "never ſee the end.

Theſe things ſucceeded the death of *Henry* 3. But there were many remarkable accidents, that preceded it, which give you an account of the Opinion of the *French Church* of that Age. We know, the *Sorbon* is, and hath always been accounted the defender of the *Gallican Liberties*, and yet in the * time of the *League* the whole *Colledge* (except *Johannes Faber* the *Dean*, and two Senior Doctors) unanimouſly determin'd, that *Henry* 3. by reaſon of the Murther of the *Duke*, and

* *V. D'Avil* &c.

Cardinal

Cardinal of *Guiſe* had forfeited his right to the Crown, and that his Subjects were free from their *Oath* of *Allegiance*; nor were *Faber*, and the other two Diſſenters (ſays *Jurieu*) diſſatisfied as to the point of Law. *i. e.* Whether the *King* were *depoſable*, or not, but as to the matter of fact, whether the crimes charged on him were true, or not, or if true, whether they deſerv'd ſo heavy a cenſure; and when the Ambaſſador of the *King* of *France* urged the *Pope*, *Sixtus* 5. to condemn the determination of the *Sorbon* with this argument, that ſuch a buſineſs did belong to *Chriſt*'s *Vicar*, and not to a petulant *Colledge* conſiſting of a few paſſionate corrupted perſons; yet the *Pope* liked the cenſure too well to condemn it. Beſides, two or three diſſenters in ſo great a body, ſignifie nothing; for, had it been in an *Aſſembly* of the *Clergy*, or in a *General Council*, the majority would eaſily have outweighed ſo ſmall a number of contrary Votes; (and if the *Syndick Faber*'s aſſerting the Right of Princes, makes this no Decree of the *Sorbon*, then the *Syndick Richer*'s aſſertion, *An.* 1611. in his Book *de Eccleſiaſtica, & politicâ poteſtate* is enough to prove, that the *Sorbon* does not acknowledge the Government of the Church to be Monarchical) nor were the *Sorboniſts* wanting to countenance this their aſſertion, ordering *Boucher*, and others to preach up the Authority of the *Pope* in ſuch caſes, and the Juſtice of the King's Depoſition; and there was a Book written in defence of the *Cenſure* (the Author of it believed to be our learned *Stapleton*, by others more likely, to to be the above named *Boucher*) *de juſta abdicatione Henrici* 3. and to make it appear, that the Aſſiſtants of the *League* lookt on it as a quarrel on the behalf of Religion; it is remarkable, that the *Duke*

of

of *Parma* left his own, and the publick concerns in *Flanders* in a very ill posture, only that he might re-enforce the *League*, and relieve *Paris*, which was likely to have fallen into the hands of *Henry* 4. who besieged it.

And now we are come to the Times, that succeeded the Parricide of *Henry the Great*, (who, tho never so heartily reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, was never forgiven the sin of his first Apostasie, as they called it, till his death) in the minority of whose Son *Lewis* 13. When the *third Estate* would have past a Law, that the *King* was deposable for no cause whatever, the *Clergy* violently opposed it, and ordered the *Cardinal de Perron* to make a Speech against it, which after they had examin'd, and approved of in the *Chamber Ecclesiastick*, they attended him to the convention of the *three Estates*, where he pronounc't it *An.* 1615. (which Speech our *King James* learnedly answer'd in his *declaratio pro jure regio*, where you may see it proved, that the Cardinal took upon him to assert, that the Pope or the Church had power to depose Princes, and that it was universally owned in *France* ever since their *Schools* had been opened; and the event made it appear, what the design of the Speech was, after which the *third Estate* saw it impossible to go on with their design successfully, and so declin'd it) and whatever *F. Maimburge* says to the contrary, yet his own argument confirms what I assert, "That when this "difference happened between the *Clergy*, and the "*third Estate* (the *two Chambers*, as he calls them) "the *Clergy* inform'd Pope *Paul* the 5. in their an- "swer to his *Breve* of *Jan.* 31. 1615. *Angebamur non* "*mediocriter, &c.* That they were troubled above "measure

* *Ub. supr. c. ult.*

" meaſure to ſee *Catholicks* tranſported with an un-
" diſcreet Zeal meddle with matters of Faith (where
" you may obſerve that the *depoſing power* is acknow-
" ledg'd by them to be a *matter of Faith, earum rerum,*
" *quæ ad fidem pertinent*, though you deny it to be ſo)
" which did not belong to the *third Eſtate*, who were
" Lay-men, and Lawyers, but withal, they confeſs,
" that the determination of this point did belong to
" the Church, *i. e.* to themſelves, and the Pope, *omnem*
" *hanc authoritatem penes Eccleſiam, eoſque ſolos eſſe, quos*
" *illa fidelium gregi præeſſe voluerit.* By which it is plain, that that Speech was not *one Doctors Opinion* only, as *Monſieur Maimbourge* affirms, but the Opinion of the whole *Chamber Eccleſiaſtick*, or their whole Clergy. And, that the *French Church* afterward owned the Opinion of that Speech, ſeems plain, becauſe the *general Aſſembly* of the Clergy *An.* 1665. gave the *Abbot Gentil* 6000. *Livres* to collect the *Memoirs* of the *Gallican* Church, which were afterward ſolemnly reviewed by ſeveral *Biſhops*, and *Abbots*, and then publiſht, among which this Speech of *Cardinal de Perron* is printed, and approved, the whole ſcope of which, *Maimbourge* himſelf confeſſes, is inconſiſtent with the independent right of Princes, and their exemption from any *depoſing power.*

It is true, this Speech, that ſo few years ſince, was Printed among the *Memoirs* with ſo much applauſe, and approbation, is now ordered to be left out of them; which is ſo far from being an argument to incline any man to acquieſce in the judgment of ſuch a Church, that it may juſtly affright him from confiding in ſuch volatile changeable men, who in ſuch weighty matters vary their Opinions

ſo

ſo often from one extreme to another. And the reaſon is plain, the *French Biſhops* following the dictates of that *Court*; ſo that ſince the quarrel about the *Regale*, they have ſought to ſtoop the *Pope*, and probably to make his Election depend on the preſent *French King*, as it did antiently on *Charles* the *Great*. And of this I could give ſome likely proofs, but that the digreſſion would be too long.

But againſt all this it is objected, That under the preſent *King Lewis* 14. the *Sorbon*, *An.* 1663. condemn'd even the *indirect Power of the Pope over Princes*, and aſſerted, that the *King of France* hath no other Superiour but God; to which we anſwer, that the ſame *Colledge* did in the days of the *League* maintain the contrary, as I have formerly proved; and at laſt the *Sorbon* is not the Repreſentative of the *French Church*, nor can it be imagined, ſays the * Author of the *ſecond Treatiſe againſt the Oath of Allegiance*, "That thoſe "men, who took upon them to vary from the Cen- "ſures, Decrees, or Definitions of *Rome*, would ever "go about to ſet up an independent, or infallible "Chair in the *Sorbon*, and deliver their Opinion ei- "ther as an Article of Faith in it ſelf, or as a Rule of "Faith to others. But the Objection is ſtrengthened, That the *Archbiſhops*, and *Biſhops* aſſembled at *Paris*, *An.* 1682. as Repreſentatives of the *French Church*, did decree the ſame; to which we † anſwer, that the Declaration was made but by *thirty* or *forty Prelates* within the verge of the Court, whereas in a free *National Council* the contrary might have been determined. But put the caſe that this had been decreed in a full, and free *National Synod*, yet neither could this have eſtabliſht an indefeaſible right; for

* *Ch.* 5. *p.* 14.

† *V. Juriea ubi ſupr.*

I remember, that in the *Convocation* under *Henry* 8. the *King's Supremacy* was decreed and eſtabliſht by our Biſhops (even by *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, &c. who in all other things were zealous *Catholicks*) and yet I ſuppoſe you will be loath to grant, that for that reaſon the *King* had a juſt Right to that *Supremacy*. And this alſo ſerves to anſwer your Objection from the Determinations of the *French Univerſities* againſt the *Depoſing Doctrine*, becauſe not onely the greateſt part of the *Univerſities* of *Chriſtendom* did allow of *Henry* the Eighth's Divorce from his firſt Wife, which the *Pope*, and perhaps you, would not allow to be lawful; but withal, the two moſt famous *Univerſities* of *England*, (which to us are equivalent to all thoſe in *France*) and the moſt famous *Monaſteries* of the Kingdom, when this Queſtion was propos'd to them, *An aliquid Autoritatis in hoc regno Angliæ Pont. Romano de jure competat, pluſquam alii cuicunque Epiſcopo extero? Whether the Pope had any lawful power in this Kingdom, more than any other forreign Prelate?* The Anſwer was generally return'd in the Negative.

Beſides, who knows not, that the generality of men ſpeak as their hopes of Preferment lead them? and that there was a great truth in that Obſervation of *Æneas Sylvius*, That many men wrote in vindication of the *Pope's* Authority, and few for the Authority of a *Council*, becauſe a *Council* gave no Dignities nor Benefices; but the *Pope* did. And I ſhould be glad to ſee the preſent *French* Clergy deal with the preſent *Pope* (when he meddles out of his Sphere with the Crowns of Princes) as their Predeceſſors did with *Gregory* the Fourth, who under the pretext of being a Mediator between the *Emperour Lewis* the *Debo-*

naire, and his Sons, promoted the Rebellion, and was ſuſpected to come with a deſigne to excommunicate the *Emperour* and his Biſhops; for they proteſted, † *Si excommunicaturus ad veniret, excommunicatus abiret*: i. e. That *if the Pope came to excommunicate them, they would excommunicate him for acting contrary to the Authority of the ancient Canons.*

† Ant. Anon. vit. *Ludovici Pii.*

* Nouvel. de la rep. de Lettres, *An.* 1685. p. 716, &c.

And at laſt we have Advice given us, * That *June* 26. *An.* 1683. at *Clermont* in *Auvergne*, the *Jeſuits* publickly maintain'd four *Theſes*, in oppoſition to the deciſion of the *French* Clergy, *An.* 1682. 1. That although they call their Theſes Explanations of the Doctrine of the *Gallican* Church, the firſt Article of the Decree did not diminiſh the ſpecial Authority of the Church over Kings and Princes Chriſtian. 2. That the ſecond Article was not intended to weaken the *Monarchick Primacy* of the *Pope* over the Church. 3. That by the third Article, they intended not to take from the *Pope* the Soveraign Power of diſpenſing with *Canons*, &c. 4. That by the fourth Article, they intended not to deprive the *Pope* of all Infallibility in matters of *Faith*. Which *Theſes*, as far as I know, yet paſs uncenſured. And the *Janſeniſt*, who goes under the name of *René Clerc Tonſuré à l'Archeveſque de Paris*, in his *Syſtem of the Theology of the Gallican Church extracted from their Memoires*, proves, that the *French Biſhops* are not ſuch Friends to Crowned heads, as they would appear to be; and that they take the Power from the *Pope* onely to place it in themſelves: affirming, *That the French King cannot be judged by a Council except the French Biſhops be there*, (implying, that then he may be judged), as if the *laſt reſort* were to them; and *that the Declarations of the*

the Pope against their King, ought not to be obeyed, till the Kingdom consent thereunto; so that if the Kingdom consent, the Deposition is lawful: with other such Positions. And the same Author affirms, That whereas some *English Gentlemen*, Decemb. 1. *An.* 1679. addressing themselves to some *Doctors of the Sorbon*, had inclined them to decide for the lawfulness of our *Oath of Allegiance*, the *Archbishop* of *Paris* sent to them, that it was the *King's* pleasure they should not decide it: which makes it plain, that the *Allegiance* of the *French* Church is founded on the *Catholick* Religion, and that an *Heretical Prince* hath not the same Right with *the most Christian.*

And though since that time † the *Sorbon*, An. 1686. hath given its approbation of the *Oath of Allegiance* with the word *Heretical* in it, yet this is onely an honest acknowledgement of the Rights of Princes, by one *Colledge* of learned men; while in the same year the *Jesuits* at *Gaunt*, in their *Provincial Congregation*, expresly condemn'd the taking of the said Oath. And who knows, but the *Sorbonists* of the next Age may do as their Predecessors of the last did in the time of the *League*, contradict all that hath lately been asserted. Nor does the Condemnation signifie any thing in your sence, since even a *General Council* cannot define any thing to be *heretical*, unless it be *de fide*, and the belief required under the penalty of an *Anathema*: and when all this is done, if the matter be of *Discipline* or *Government* you profess, you may safely refuse to obey the *Council.*

† V. Caus. Valesian. append. 6.

To which Observation I will adde one *Remark* more: That though *Monsieur* * *Arnald* hath written in

* Apologie pour la Clergie.

vindication of the *French Church*, that they never owned the *Deposing Doctrine*, yet if he be the Author of the *Jesuits Morals*, (for though *Monsieur Pascbal* his Nephew have the honour of the Book, yet all men believe that *Arnald* had a great hand in the contriving it) he hath not dealt so ingenuously in this case, as he might: for when he quotes so many Passages out of the *Moralists of the Society*, what liberty they give to *violate Sacraments* or *Oaths*, to *Lye* and *Equivocate*, and *to break all Trusts, Vows*, and *Promises*, he never so much as touches on the many palpable Propositions in their Books, which encourage and allow of the breach of *Allegiance* to Princes.

I have little more to subjoyn, but this: That whereas you appeal to the *Council* of *Trent* for the Faith of your Church, I have observed in that *Council* some things (how cunningly soever the *Decrees* were contrived, and how warily soever they were penn'd) which seem not to accord so well with your *Catholick Principles*. For instance: 1. † The *Council* says, *Si quis dixerit*, &c. *If any man shall say, that the Canon of the Mass contains any Errours in it, let him be Anathema.* And in another place * the *Mass* is said to be *free from all Errour.* Now if it be so, I suppose some of your Doctrines must fall to the ground, being confuted by your *Mass*. As, 1. The Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: for after the Consecration, the Priest calls the Sacrament *Bread and Wine*; *Offerimus panem sanctum vitæ æternæ, & calicem salutis perpetuæ*: And afterward desires God to *look down upon it, as he did on the Sacrifices of* Abel, Abraham, *and* Melchizedeck: And prays, *That those things might be carried by the hands of the holy Angels of God into Heaven.* For how

† Sess. 22. de Sacrif. missæ can. 6.

* cap. 4.

afe

are theſe Expreſſions ſuited to Chriſt's *Corporeal Preſence*? 2. All the Prayers of the Maſs relate to a *Communion*, and ſo are a confutation of *private Maſs*; and yet the Prieſt in a *private Maſs*, when no one but himſelf receives, ſays, *Ut quotquot ex hâc altaris*, &c. *That as many of us as have received the moſt holy Body of thy Son*, &c. 3. To inſtance in no more, the *Prayer for the Dead* in this Canon doth not relate to *Purgatory*: for the Prieſt ſays, *Memento, Domini*, &c. *Remember, O Lord, thy Servants, and thy Handmaids* (and then names the Perſons whom he is to pray for) *who have gone before us with the mark of Faith, and ſleep in the ſleep of Peace.* Which are plain demonſtrations, that thoſe Prayers were made before thoſe new Doctrines and Practices were the Belief and Cuſtoms of your Church, or elſe there are Errours in the *Maſs*, which the *Council* under an *Anathema* forbids any man to affirm.

2. The *Council* declares, † *Epiſcopos in Apoſtolorum locum ſucceſſiſſe*; That *Biſhops are the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles*: and if ſo, then there being an equality among the *Apoſtles*, ſo there is alſo among *Biſhops*; and where then is the *Pope's* Supereminent Power as Succeſſor to St. *Peter*? and how is he above his fellow-Biſhops, if they all ſucceed the *Apoſtles*, to uſe St. *Cyprian's* Phraſe, *Pari conſortio & poteſtatis, & honoris*; *In an equal right to power and honour*?

† Seſſ. 23. cap. 4.

3. The *Council* * commands the interpretation of Scripture *according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers*: and if ſo, we are well aſſured, that the Controverſies between us will be eaſily decided on the ſide of the *Church of England*, for to the *Fathers* we are ready to appeal.

* Seſſ. 4.

And

And now after all this, ſuffer me to aſſure you, that though I love your generous dealing in the affixing your *Anathema's* at the end of your † Book, (wherein you deal much more candidly than many of your Brethren) yet I cannot but mind you, that you have left your ſelf and others, by reaſon of the generality of your Expreſſions, liberty to explain your meaning; and therefore I have added ſome *Anathema's* agreeable to your own notions of things, (if I underſtand you aright) to which I ſhould be glad to find that you ſincerely ſay *Amen:* and it is as lawful for me, who am but a private perſon in the *Engliſh Church*, as it is for you to do ſo in the name of the *Church of Rome*. And withal, I do engage to make good, that all theſe Opinions which I propoſe to be condemn'd, are maintain'd by ſome Writers of the *Church of Rome*.

† Popery Miſ-repreſ. p. 117, 118.

1. *He who pays true and proper Religious Worſhip to Images, let him be Anathema. Amen.*
2. *Whoſoever confides in the Interceſſion of Saints and Angels, as much as in that of Jeſus Chriſt, for Salvation, let him be Anathema. Amen.*
3. *Whoſoever believes the bleſſed Virgin to have as much power in Heaven as her Son, and prays to her to command him, and begs from her, pardon of Sins, and the aſſurance of Salvation, let him be Anathema. Amen.*
4. *He who does not believe that the Merits of Jeſus Chriſt are the onely meritorious cauſe of our Salvation, let him be Anathema. Amen.*
5. *He who believes that a Papal Indulgence doth remit Sins, or deliver from eternal Death, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

6. *He*

6. *He who believes that the performance of Eccleſiaſtical Penances makes ſatisfaction for eternal Puniſhment due to his Sins, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

7. *He who ſpeaks irreverently of Holy Scripture, and calls it Æſop's Fables, a Noſe of Wax, and unſens'd Characters,* &c. *let him be Anathema. Amen.*

8. *He who believes that the Church hath power* (*in a General Council, or otherwiſe*) *to make additions to the Chriſtian Faith, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

9. *He who believes the Pope to have any perſonal Infallibility, either* è Cathedra, *or in* Conclave, *let him be Anathema. Amen.*

10. *He who aſſerts, that the Pope, or any other, hath any power to depoſe Princes, to diſpence with their Subjects Allegiance, and to authorize them to take up Arms againſt them, either upon the account of Hereſie, or for any other cauſe, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

11. *He who aſſerts, that the Pope, or any other, hath any power to diſpenſe with any Moral Law of God, and to give men a Licenſe to Murther, Forſwear, Lye, or Equivocate, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

12. *He who believes any thing contrary to the Word of God, to Reaſon, and Antiquity, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

13. *He who ſays, that men are not bound to the obligation of the Ten Commandments, (and among them, of what we call the Second, you a part of the Firſt) under pain of eternal Damnation, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

14. *He*

14. *He who thinks that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, and that Mutual Toleration may be used with men of another Perſuaſion, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

15. *He who thinks that Attrition is enough to fit a man for Abſolution, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

16. *He who thinks that any thing beſides a ſincere and true Repentance, can bring a man to Heaven, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

17. *He who believes that the modern Miracles of the Bleſſed Virgin, &c. are to be credited, as he credits the Miracles of our Bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles recorded in Scripture, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

18. *He who thinks Ignorance to be the Mother of Devotion, and wilfully hides the Holy Scriptures from the ſight and knowledge of the People, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

19. *He who ſays a man ought to obey his Superiours (whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical) in things that are ſinful, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

20. *He who maintains any other Doctrines, than what were eſtabliſh'd by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and believ'd in the Primitive Church, let him be Anathema. Amen.*

Theſe I give you as a *Specimen*; and when theſe are condemn'd, I ſhall think my ſelf much more inclinable to be reconciled, than now I am.

And becauſe you are a private Perſon, and whatever you ſay, is but *one Doctor's Opinion*; and becauſe your Writers differ where your *Infallibility* is fixt, whether in a *General Council*, or the *Pope*, and if in the

the *Pope*, whether in his ſingle Perſon, or in *Conclave*; you will oblige the World, if you uſe your intereſt to get theſe Doctrines Condemn'd by the *Pope, ex Cathedra*, (and ſo you will bind the *Jeſuits* and others, who believe the *Perſonal Infallibility*) and by the *Conclave of Cardinals*, (for this will bind others of your Communion) and by a *Council* of all the Prelates of your Church, (and this will bind you, the *French Church*, and all others that call themſelves *Roman Catholicks*:) for unleſs this be done, we are ſtill where we were. And I ſhall tell you, that the regaining ſo conſiderable a part of the *Proteſtants*, as the *Church of England* is, out of a ſtate of *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*, (as you are pleaſed in your great Charity to call it) is a Reaſon weighty enough to ſummon ſuch a *Council*, and to do what is required towards an Accommodation: and till this is done, all that you ſay elſe, is but the ſprinkling of a little *Holy Water*, and *gratis dictum*. And this I write to you, becauſe you appear the Advocate of your Party, while I acknowledge that I make theſe Propoſals onely as a private Perſon; though I doubt not, but all the *Prelates* of the *Church of England* would rejoyce to ſee ſo much done towards the healing of the Breaches of *Chriſtendom*. Amen.

And here I thought to have put a period to this *Eſſay*, had not your *Vindication* of your *Reflections* come to my hands; upon which I cannot but beſtow a few *Remarks*, while your learned Adverſary will take care of a more full Reply. In which, among other things, you undertake to † prove, by ſeveral inſtances, *That our Church is guilty of miſ-repreſenting yours, becauſe it impeaches the Papiſts of Idolatry in the worſhipping of Images*: and we acknowledge that the

† Proteſt, Popery, &c. p. 16.

does ſo impeach you; but withal we affirm, that there is a great difference between what is ſpoken by any man, or any Society of men, in a *Homily* or Sermon, and what is *thetically* laid down as an Article, or maintain'd in diſputation, (you your ſelves, as well as we, being often forc'd to make uſe of this diſtinction to ſalve many Sayings of the *Fathers*, that they were ſpoken not *Dogmatically*, but *Rhetorically*;) but we need not depend on this Anſwer, for our *Homily* does not ſpeak of the *Canons* of your *Councils*, but of the received Opinions and Practices of your *Church*. Now that 'tis a current Opinion among many of your *School-men*, *That the Image ought to have the ſame Worſhip with the Prototype*, I have already proved, out of Cardinal *Bellarmine*; and that the Practice of the Common People in this caſe, was very diſallowable, and much like the Idolatry of the Heathen, as I underſtand the *Trent-Council*, is the Complaint in † general of thoſe Fathers, and of ſome other of your Writers in particular: ſo that herein the *Homily* ſpeaks but the ſence of your own Authors, and with Juſtice, cenſures the Uſages of the People of your Communion. And if what your * *Council* ſays, be true, *That the Idolatry of the Heathens did conſiſt in their putting their truſt in their Idols*, he who conſiders how much more Worſhip there is paid to the ſame Images of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, (at *Loretto*, *Monſerrat*, &c.) than to other her Images elſewhere, (which can as well put the People in mind of the *Mother of God*, as thoſe famous Shrines) will be perſwaded, that the generality of your Communion put their truſt alſo in the Image, as did the Heathens in their Idols.

† Seſſ. 25. de Imag.

* Ibid.

Now, to vindicate your Church from Idolatry in

this

this case, though you † acknowledge, *That you do give Religious Honour to Images*, yet you say, That *that Honour cannot be called Idolatry, unless it makes a God of that to which it is paid.* But does not the *Second Commandment* (as we reckon them) forbid the worshipping of the true God by an Image? And do not the worst of Idolaters say, That they do not worship the Image, but the God, who is represented by it? Doth not *Celsus* say so much on the behalf of the *Gentile* Idolaters to *Origen* *, τὶς γὰρ ἄλλος, &c. *Who, but a perfect Fool, thinks an Image made of Stone or Timber, of Brass or Gold, to be a God?* &c. And for the *Jews*, when they fell into Idolatry in the Wilderness, by worshipping the *Golden Calf*, they onely worshipt it as a representation of the true God: for the Feast that was set apart for it, is called † a *Feast held to Jehovah*, which is the incommunicable Name of the onely true God. (And the like might be said of the *Calves* in *Dan* and *Bethel*.) But perhaps you are of the opinion of some men of Eminence in your own Communion, (and whose Books have never been, that I know of, condemn'd) who think that the Worship of the Golden Calf was not Idolatry: for so *Moncœus* in his *Aaron Purgatus* expresly affirms, as * *Greg. de Valentia* in his *Apologetic* for *Idolatry*, (a bold Title for a Book written by a Christian Priest!) argues from 1 *Pet.* 4. 3. that because the Apostle doth forbid *unlawful Idolatries*, (*abominable Idolatries*, as our *Translation* renders it) that therefore there is some *Idolatry* that is lawful, which is that of the *Worship of Images*.

† Protest. Pop. p. 33.

* Lib. 7. p. 373. Orig. contr. Cels.

† Exod. 32. 5.

* c. 7. p. 49.

But you object, † that *we our selves are by this Argument guilty of Idolatry, by bowing to the Altar, and*

† Protest. Pop. p. 34.

to the Name of Jesus, and by kneeling at the Sacrament. Whereas, I must tell you, that we bow not to the *Altar*, but towards it, toward the *East*, where the *Christian Altar* always used to stand, (and toward which part of Heaven the Primitive Christians used to direct even their private Devotions;) nor do we bow to the Name, but at the Recital of the Name of our blessed Saviour: so that we pay no Religious Worship to the *Altar*, or to the Syllables of that Venerable Name, (as you confess you do to *Images*) and when we kneel, we profess we do not worship the Sacramental Elements, nor the Body and Bloud of Christ hid under the Accidents of Bread and Wine; but we kneel, because then we pray, and we worship God, to whom we direct our Prayers: so that these actions are not external acts of Adoration to any thing that is seen, or heard, but onely to God. But by this way of arguing, I perceive, *the Cause* wants assistance, when you borrow Arguments from our Dissenters to assault our Church with: for these are their little Objections that have been so often hist off the Stage.

You further tell us, That *it is the intention of the Person who pays the Worship, that makes the Worship either idolatrous or lawful.* And if so, pray tell me, if a Christian in the *East Indies* should go into a *Pagod*, and bow down before one of their *Images*, and pay it in all respects the same outward Adoration that its most bigotted Votaries offer it, and at the same time *intend* his Worship towards the *blessed Trinity*, does this man, by virtue of his *intention*, escape the guilt of *Idolatry*? And I put you this Question the more willingly, because some of your *Jesuits* have determined it in the affirmitive, and acquit the votary of *Idolatry*,

Italy, and I would willingly know your Opinion: for if you conſult the † *Provincial Letters*, the Author of them will tell you, that the *Jeſuits* in *China*, and other places of the *Indies*, taught the People that they might publickly worſhip the Idols of the Country, *Cacin choan*, and *Keumfucum*, ſo they directed this Adoration of theirs intentionally to the Image of our bleſſed Saviour hid under their Cloaths; and that this is no Calumny, the ſame Author ſays *, That the Practice was complain'd of, and cenſured at *Rome*, *July* 9. *An.* 1646. But notwithſtanding that Cenſure, if your way of arguing be good, the Practice is ſtill lawful.

† Let. 5. p. 61. Edit. Let. Colon. *An.* 1658.

* P. 62.

Now to evade your Adverſaries Argument, *That intention cannot alter the nature of actions, which are determin'd by either Divine or Humane Law*; you ſhift the force of the reaſoning, by making a Plea from the ſame Principle for the *Quakers*, (and probably it is well done of you, to turn Advocate for a *Sect* which owes its Original to the *Jeſuits*, and other *Emiſſaries* of your own Church) becauſe, if *intention cannot alter the nature of actions determined by Law*, no Oaths can be lawful, nor the payment of civil Honour allowed of, becauſe the Scripture ſays, *Swear not at all, and let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, and you ſhall not be called Maſter*, &c. And the Anſwer would ſignifie ſomething, if you could ſhew us any place of Scripture where ſuch *Worſhip* hath been paid to *Images*, notwithſtanding the divine determination to the contrary, as we can ſhew you for the allowance of thoſe things which you object: for we there read, that notwithſtanding the prohibition, the Apoſtles did allow of the Title *Lord*, or *Sir*, or *Maſter*; for St. *Philip*

† Johan. 12. 21. * Acts 16. 30.

Philip expreſt no diſlike, when † the *Greeks* gave him that appellation; nor St. *Paul* and *Silas*, * when the Jaylor at *Philippi* treated them with the ſame language. And by *Swear not at all*, &c. the Holy Writ onely forbids vain and raſh Swearing, and Perjury, and double Dealing, &c. for it in other places tolerates and requires *Oaths, which*, ſays the *Apoſtle, are the end of all ſtrife.* After which, you will do well to ſhew any place of Holy Scripture, that countenances the *Worſhip of Images*, and we ſhall willingly acknowledge the parity of Reaſon: for it is not the intention of the Perſon commanded, but of the Lawgiver, that makes an action lawful: for did a mans own intention legitimate his actions that are otherwiſe forbidden by any Law divine or humane, then a man may *do evil, that good may come thereof*, expreſly againſt St. *Paul*; a man may commit Murther, Sacriledge, and every other groſs ſin, as ſome men have done, and plead for himſelf, that he intended nothing but Reformation, and the advancement of Religion; as the men in our *Saviour's* time perſecuted the *Apoſtles* to death, with an intention to *do God ſervice*: but the intention of the Lawgiver, when made known, is that which legitimates the actions of the ſubject either in matters purely civil, or in matters of Religion, of which latter ſort is the *Worſhip of Images*; which I ſhall acknowledge to be lawful, when you ſhall have ſhewn that it is agreeable to the intention of our ſupreme Lawgiver.

But the further management of this Argument, I leave to your other Antagoniſt, while I obſerve, that † you ſhift him off with no other Anſwer, but this: *That a Queſtion or two is* (in his opinion) *a confutation*

† Proteſt. Pop. p. 25.

tion of the Reflecter, because you are ask'd, *Whether all your Representations are conformable to the sense of the* Trent-*Council and Catechism?* which I have already proved they are not, particularly in the Doctrine of the *assistance of Angels and Saints*, which you say, consists *onely in their Prayers*, while the *Council* and *Catechism*, besides their *Intercession*, mention their *Merits* and *Aid*. And whereas, when he objects against the *Pope's licensing the Bishop of* Condom's *Book*, that *Canus* with judgment avers, *That whatever the Pope determines privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See*; you rejoyn, that the *Pope's private determination* of any Opinion, doth not hinder it from being *the judgment of the Apostolick See*, unless it be also determined *maliciously* and *inconsiderately*; I cannot understand *Canus* in that sence, but that, whatever is determined either *privately*, or *maliciously*, or *inconsiderately*, is not the judgment of the *Apostolick See*: for if this be not so, then a *private determination*, how *malicious* soever it can be, so it be upon due *consideration*, may be the *judgment of the Apostolick See*. And who knows, but the present *Pope's* allowance of the *Bishop of Condom's* Book, may be the product of malice, of his spleen against the *French Hereticks*, as he calls them, for whose Extirpation he hath so solemnly by his Letters thanked the *French King*? And if *Malice* may invalidate the *Papal Judgment*, why may not *Favour*, *Affection*, or *Fear*, when they interpose in such Determinations, render them equally invalid? And if so, why may not the reason of the present *Pope's* not censuring the *French Clergie* in the matters relating to the *Papal Power over Princes*, be his *fear*, lest that Victorious Prince should either set

up

up a *Patriarch* of his own in *France*, or by an Army establish his Right in *Italy*, and make the *Pope* depend on him for his Election.

But to confirm the Authority of the *Bishop of Condom's* Book, you say, *That it was printed at* Rome, *translated into divers Languages, and attested by the Pope and divers Cardinals, &c.* Will you allow of all that hath been publish'd for *Catholick Doctrine* at *Rome*, with the same or the like approbation? Were not Cardinal *Baronius's Annales* (to instance onely in one Book) printed at *Rome* in the Press belonging to the *Vatican* Palace? Did not Pope *Sixtus* V. prefix a very large Epistle in commendation of the Author, and the Work? Was it not magnified by the *Roman Cardinals*? Was it not translated into *Italian*, *German*, *Polish*, and other Languages, and the *two first Tomes* of it into *Arabick*? Now if such a Recommendation be sufficient to make known the Sentiments of your Church, then how comes it to pass, that those *Ecclesiastical Annals* are not received in *France* in those things relating to Regal Power, nor in *Spain* in what relates to the Right to the Kingdom of *Sicily*? And if you do allow of the *Annals*, you must not onely interfere with the fore-named Churches of your Communion, but you must also acknowledge, what you will be loath to own, that the *Pope* hath a right to dispose of his Majesties Kingdoms, as in truth that Cardinal hath intituled him to almost all the other Kingdoms of the World by name.

† P. 50. Edit. Novist. It is also observable, that the Bishop of † *Condom*, when he speaks of the *Pope*, mentions the *Primacy*; but for the *Deposing Doctrine*, he says, *It is not necessary*

to

to speak of it; adding in general, *That all Catholicks acknowledge a Head eſtabliſh'd by God to conduct his whole Flock in his paths, which thoſe who love Concord among Brethren, and Eccleſiaſtical Unanimity, will moſt willingly acknowledge.* By which expreſſion every man is left to his own Sentiments in that point; and it is no wonder, that the *Pope* (though he does believe his own *Power of Depoſing Princes*) doth approve of this Book, for the Phraſe of *conducting the whole Flock of Chriſt*, is as eaſily to be conſtrued, as *paſce oves meas*, to ſignifie the *Depoſing of Princes* whenever the *Pope* pleaſes. So that we ſee, that even this ſeeming Enemy of the *Depoſing Doctrine*, dares not openly condemn it, but leaves it as a probable Opinion, and *what 'tis not neceſſary to ſpeak of*; ſo that every *Pope* hath ſtill his liberty to declare any Prince a Heretick, and then to proceed to Excommunicate, and to Depoſe him; after which, a *Clement*, a *Ravillac*, or any other Aſſaſine, may proceed to murther him, becauſe he himſelf alſo is left at liberty to believe that the *Pope* is in the right, when he hath depoſed a Prince, and that he ought, as much as lies in him, to obey him in bringing ſuch Criminals to condign puniſhment.

At laſt † you tell us, *That a man may be admitted into your Church, notwithſtanding his refuſal to admit the Depoſing Doctrine, and the Pope's Infallibility, but as they are ſtated by the Repreſenter*, i. e. *not as Articles of Faith.* But this ſeems to imply, that no man of your Communion ſhall dare to condemn the Doctrines, which muſt ſtill be look'd on as probable and diſputable; ſo that the ſafety of Princes and Kingdoms, and the guidance of the Church in matters of Faith (which depend on the plain ſtating of the *Pope's Power* and

† Proteſt. Pop. p. 29.

Infallibility) muſt ſtill be left at the mercy of opinionative men, who may take liberty to diſpute and write about theſe great and weighty points *pro* and *con*, as themſelves think fit.

And whereas your Adverſary quotes *Bellarmine*, and *Canus*, *That General Councils cannot erre even in Decrees of Diſcipline and Government* (decreta morum) *when they relate to things neceſſary to Salvation, and concern the whole Church*, you * deny, that the *Depoſing Doctrine is of that nature*. But are not the plain Offices of Morality neceſſary to Salvation, as well as Articles of Faith? If not, then nothing but Infidelity damns a man; and if a man's Faith be Orthodox, it is no matter for his Converſation: If they are neceſſary, is not Obedience to Princes one of the moral Commands of God? And if ſo, is not the practice of that Obedience neceſſary to Salvation? and is not Diſobedience (which neceſſarily follows the *Depoſing Doctrine*) a great ſin? And if ſo, deſtructive of the hopes of Salvation. And that *it concerns the whole Church*, is eaſily proved, becauſe Princes are its Nurſing-Fathers.; and what Evils have fallen upon your own Church by ſuch raſh Attempts, ſome of your own Authors will tell you, is plain from the inſtance of *Henry* VIII. Beſides, the whole Chriſtian Church and its Welfare, is concern'd in the Doctrine: for though all the Princes of *Chriſtendom* have never been depoſed at once, yet what is done in one Country, may be done throughout all *Chriſtendom*, and ſo the whole Church actually concern'd in the ſad effects of the Doctrine: And had the *Empire* been as intire under *Henry* IV, as it was under the elder *Emperours*, his Depoſition had actually concern'd the whole Church.

* Proteſt. Pop. p. 32.

And

And because you call that assertion, that *the Pope hath not condemn'd the no-deposing Power, because he wants power so to do*, an *Oracle*, and say, *you look for an Argument to prove it.* It is plain from History, that those *Popes* who have been rich, and stout, and powerful, have adventured on the practice of Deposing (while others of lower Spirits, less Wealth and Haughtiness, have been afraid of the Attempt) we are not ignorant what the *Dictates* of *Pope Gregory* VII. are, and how busie he was, being back'd by the *Countess Maud*, who supported him with her interest; nor what *Innocent* III, *Sixtus* V, and some others have done in imitation of him. Nor is it unknown to the World, what Pope *Paul* V. thundered against the *Republick of Venice*, What *Pius* V. did here in *England*, and *Innocent* X. in *Ireland* during the Rebellion there: for what was it that encouraged those hot *Popes* to go so far, but that they thought their interest, at least in the Church-men, so great, that the Countries would immediately have shaken off their Soveraigns? And what is it that causes the present *Pope* to spare the *French King* about the *Regale*, but that he is afraid of him, and knows he wants power to compel him? Nor need the Argument seem so ridiculous to you, since Cardinal *Bellarmine* (a man from whom most of your Writers borrow all their Materials) doth not onely affirm, that the *Primitive Christians* under the *Heathen Emperours*, did not take up Arms against them, *because they wanted power*, but avers against *Barclay* †, that the *ancient Popes did not exert their Authority against the Emperours* Constantius *and* Valens, &c. *not because they had no right*, sed quod Reges, &c. *but because without great damage the Church could*

† Tom. 3. Oper. c. 6, 7, 8. p. 874, &c.

nat compel them; but that *the Popes did exert their Authority against* Leo Isauricus, Henry IV. *and* Childeric, *because they were able to compel them. That* Julian *was very powerful, and attended with many armed Legions, against which an unarm'd Multitude signified nothing; that it was a falshood that all his Army were Christians, and that St.* Gregory *affirms, that the Church made use of no other Remedy but her Tears,* quia deerant vires, *because she wanted strength to resist the Tyranny.* So that, pray answer your own *Cardinal*, or else acknowledge, that your Adversary speaks such *Oracles* as may be confirm'd from some other Topick, besides the authority of the Assertor.

And now I shall put a period to these *Remarks*, when I have minded you of two things which are your own Concessions.

* Protest. Pop *p.* 6, 7, 17, 18.

1. *That* * *upon the consideration of what is here charg'd, the salvation of every Roman Catholick's Soul depends, that their Eternity is at stake; and that if Popery be guilty of what your Answerer says it is, it cannot enter into your thoughts, that there is any room for it* (or its Followers) *in Heaven: That all our Martyrs died for a good Cause, and are doubtless in Heaven: That such Tenents bid open defiance to true Honesty and Christianity, strike at the World's Redeemer, and are impossible to be entertain'd by any, who is one degree above a Beast.* These are the Conclusions I acknowledge, of a wise, a modest, and a good man; but then it behoves you seriously to consider whether this Charge be not true, and whether your Adversary be not to be acquitted of wronging your Church, (of which the impartial Reader will be the most competent

tent Judge) and withal to think, whether those *School-men*, and other Writers of your Communion, that do own all the Doctrines charg'd upon you, be not by your own Verdict, *Men of no Honesty, no Religion, and but one degree above Beasts:* For by this Concession every unbyast person is able to satisfie himself which is the true Religion, that which allows its Followers to assert the Doctrine of *Deposing Princes*, to pay *Religious Worship to Images*, to expect *more than intercession from Saints, Angels*, &c. or that which is directed by the Revelations made in Holy Scriptures, and by the unanimous Interpretations made of those Scriptures by the ancient Fathers, as the *Church of England* expressly doth.

2. That you follow the methods of the *French Church* [which is so far from being the *Catholick Church*, even in your sence of the word, that it is but a small part of it] from them you take your Principles, from the *Bishop of Condom*, and *Monsieur Veron*; and after their Example, you make your complaints of being *misrepresented:* for so the *Gallican Bishops* did in their late *general Assemblies*, held *July* 11. *An.* 1685. complain of *being misrepresented, and of the Calumnies, Injuries, and Falsities, which the Reformed Churches lay to their charge*; desiring that King, in their *Petition* prefixt to the *Acts* of that *Assembly*, to revoke all the *Edicts* made in behalf of the *Hugonots*, because *permitted onely in times of disturbance, and for reasons which no longer subsist:* which though they afterwards modifie and limit onely to the passing an *Edict* to forbid the calumniating their Religion, yet every considering man sees what they aim at. And upon this Address the King past an *Edict*, *Aug.* 23. forbidding all the

Reformed

Reformed to preach or write any thing againſt the *Catholick Religion*, either directly or indirectly, and to allow them the liberty of the Preſs onely for printing the *Confeſſion of their Faith, their Prayers, and the Rules of their Diſcipline*, but no other Books written by the *Reformed Divines* of that Kingdom; and what the effects of that and other *Edicts* have been, every wiſe Obſerver hath ſeen.

" May our bleſſed and holy Saviour, the true and " undoubted Head of the Catholick Church, heal all " the Breaches thereof, convert all Hereticks to the " knowledge of the Truth; ſhame, and bring back " all Schiſmaticks into the Unity of his Myſtical Body, " that we may be one Sheepfold under one Shepherd, " the Biſhop of our Souls. *Amen.*

FINIS.

Advertiſement of BOOKS Printed for *Samuel Smith* at the Princes Arms in St. *Paul's* Church-yard.

THE Vanity of all Pretences for Tolleration, wherein the Late *Pleas* for *Tolleration* are fully anſwered; and the Popular Arguments drawn from the Practice of the United *Netherlands* are ſtated at large, and ſhewn to be weak, fallacious, and inſufficient. *Quarto.*

The Book of *Bertram* or *Ratramnus*, Prieſt and Monk of *Corbey*, concerning the Body and Bloud of the Lord, in Latine: With a New Engliſh Tranſlation more exact than the former. Alſo an Hiſtorical Diſſertation concerning the Author and this Work, wherein both are vindicated from the Exceptions of the Writers of the Church of *Rome*.

Proteſtancy proved Safer than Popery, by a late Convert to the Church of *England.*

Miſcellanea in quibus Continentur præmonitio ad Lectorem de infantum Communione apud Græcos. Defenſio Libri de Græcæ Eccleſ. ſtatu contra Object. Authoris Hiſt. Criticæ, ſuper fide & Ritibus orientalium. Brevis & ſuccincta Narratio de Vita, ſtudiis, Geſtis, & Martyrio D. Cyrilli Lucarii, Patriarchæ Conſtantinopolitani.

Commentatio de Hymnis matutino & Veſpertino Græcorum. Exercitatio Theologica de Cauſis remediiſque diſſidiorum

diorum quæ orbem Christianum hodiè affligunt. Authore Thoma Smith, *Eccles. Angl. Presbyt.* 1686. Octavo.

History of the Original and Progress of Ecclesiastical Revenues. By the Learned *P. Simon.* Octavo.

Enquiry after Happiness, by the Author of *Practical Christianity.* Octavo.

The Duty of Servants: containing, 1. How Parents ought to breed up their Children, that they may be fit to be employed and trusted. 2. How Servants may wisely chuse a Service. 3. How they are to behave themselves in it, in discharging their Duty towards God, their Master, and themselves, with Prayers suited to each Duty. To which is added a Discourse of the Sacrament, intended chiefly for Servants. By the Author of *Practical Christianity. Octavo.*

Miracles, Works above and contrary to Nature: or, an Answer to a late Translation out of *Spinosa's Tractatus Theolog. Politicus*, Mr. *Hobbs's Leviathan*, &c. *Quarto.*

A Sermon about Frequent Communion. By Dr. *Tho. Smith.* Quarto.

26052